Beginning of

Some relationships between Second Isaiah and the Pentateuch

This title was preceded by

Religious experience and reason as the sources of Jonathan Edwards' doctrine of God

Prayer in intertestamental literature

The nature of faith in the thought of Søren Kierkegaard

Search by title on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1942
call number Thesis Cage 1942 A

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/somerelationship00unse

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SECOND ISAIAH AND THE PENTATEUCH

ELSIE THOMAS CULVER
B.A., University of California, 1918
M.A., Pacific School of Religion, 1940

THESIS

Submitted in the Department of
Old Testament in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity
in Pacific School of Religion 1942

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
SECOND ISAIAH AND THE PENTATEUCH

ELSIE THOMAS CULVER
B.A., University of California, 1918
M.A., Pacific School of Religion, 1940

THESIS

Submitted in the Department of
Old Testament in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity
in Pacific School of Religion 1942

Table of Contents

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
SECOND ISAIAH AND THE PENTATEUCH

Table of Contents i

Foreword ii

Chapter I: Method 1

Chapter II: A Comparison of Ideas 4

A. The Creation: an Exilic Concept . . . 4

B. The Exodus: a Concept Common to All Sources 27

C. An Ancient Source 53

D. A Late Song: Deut. 32:1-43 75

E. The Hope for the Future: the Law or the Servant 101

Chapter III: Additional References 125

A. J and E 125

B. D 129

C. P 133

Note A: Discarded Material 134

Note B: Proper Names 142

Chapter IV: A Suggested Reconstruction . . . 146

Bibliography 150

Table of Contents

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
SECOND ISAIAH AND THE PENTATEUCH

Table of Contents i

Foreword ii

Chapter I: Method 1

Chapter II: A Comparison of Ideas 4

A. The Creation: an Exilic Concept . . . 4

B. The Exodus: a Concept Common to
All Sources 27

C. An Ancient Source 53

D. A Late Song: Deut. 32:1-43 75

E. The Hope for the Future: the Law
or the Servant 101

Chapter III: Additional References 125

A. J and E 125

B. D 129

C. P 133

Note A: Discarded Material 134

Note B: Proper Names 142

Chapter IV: A Suggested Reconstruction . . . 149

Bibliography 150

FOREWORD

There can be few problems of Old Testament criticism on which it would be more gratifying to find a gleam of real light than on the relationship of Second Isaiah and the Pentateuch. By the very nature of any such investigation as this thesis represents, most of the findings are destined to be negative, blind alleys yielding no results worth reporting. Equally discouraging are the times when the most carefully scrutinized evidence has seemed to point in many directions at once. It has been impossible, in the scope of this thesis, to check and weigh findings against other available material. Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Psalms and Job, for instance, should have been considered for light on many passages, an obviously impractical procedure for a short paper. I present in the end not conclusions but tentative suggestions for verification or rejection as further evidence warrants.

I want to thank Dr. James Muilenburg for having suggested the possibilities of this topic, helped me with many of the problems, and especially for having inspired me, during my Old Testament courses at Pacific School of Religion, with a devotion to Second Isaiah which makes even the most ardourous work in that field worth while. I also thank Dr. C. C. McCown for having read and criticised the manuscript.

FOREWORD

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SECOND ISAIAH AND THE PENTATEUCH

CHAPTER I

METHOD

Critics have long remarked the desirability of an adequate investigation of the relationships of Second Isaiah and the Pentateuch. To cover such a subject with even a pretext of thoroughness would, however, be a task beyond the scope of a short thesis. And to limit it is difficult, since very often the most rewarding investigations are those which at first sight seemed least promising. Yet some limitation had to be set, and in order to avoid too much subjectivity in the choice of materials, the following procedure was adopted:

Three commentaries were chosen, those of Cheyne, Skinner and Torrey, and at the beginning of our investigation notice was taken of every reference which these scholars made to the Pentateuch in their writings on Second Isaiah. To the list thus gleaned were added marginal references from the King James version. Many references on the list were at once discarded as quite irrelevant to our line of inquiry.

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SECOND ISAIAH AND THE PENTATEUCH

CHAPTER I

METHOD

Critics have long remarked the desirability of an adequate investigation of the relationships of Second Isaiah and the Pentateuch. To cover such a subject with even a pretext of thoroughness would, however, be a task beyond the scope of a short thesis. And to limit it is difficult, since very often the most rewarding investigations are those which at first sight seemed least promising. Yet some limitation had to be set, and in order to avoid too much subjectivity in the choice of materials, the following procedure was adopted:

Three commentaries were chosen, those of Cheyne, Skinner and Torrey, and at the beginning of our investigation notice was taken of every reference which these scholars made to the Pentateuch in their writings on Second Isaiah. To the list thus gleaned were added marginal references from the King James version. Many references on the list were at once discarded as quite irrelevant to our line of inquiry.

Many others were added as they came to light in the course of study. The list formed only a starting point, but it gave some assurance that there was at least a degree of evenness in the approach.

While it is interesting to point out correspondences between Second Isaiah and the Pentateuch as we know them, we must not fall into the error of taking what may be only chance correspondences too seriously, seeing dependence where there is only coincidence, or possibly evidence of a common redactor at work. Nor must we overestimate the weight of the negative evidence we might adduce from lack of verbal correspondences. Brief allusions rather than long quotations are what we would expect.

It is evident from even a casual reading that Second Isaiah's use of early sources is the dependence of being completely saturated with Hebrew literature. It would be quite understandable that he subconsciously used the very phraseology of his predecessors. What we should like to know is whether his familiarity with Pentateuchal sources came after they had been compiled into the Pentateuch by P, or whether he knew them <u>as sources</u>, just as P did. If the latter is the case, did they both know all the same sources? And if so, or if they knew even some of the same ones, did Second Isaiah show preferences, as between them, that differed

from P's evaluation?

In discussing relationships there are certain obvious possibilities:

1. Second Isaiah may have known the Pentateuch substantially as it now stands.

2. He may have known the Pentateuch and other early documents, or parts of documents, which, for one reason or another, the P editor had decided not to include in his magnum opus, but which were still available and could be consulted. Even if he knew the Pentateuch, these older documents may have been more familiar and more congenial to Second Isaiah than was P's work.

3. He may have known only the earlier documents -- the same ones known to P and other contemporary writers, and which each used as he saw fit, selecting and interpreting according to his own light as to the religious literary needs of the day for the Hebrew people.

4. P may have known, and have been influenced by Second Isaiah, though his writings were, like those of the earlier prophets, not appropriate for inclusion in the Pentateuch.

In all cases where we find relationships, we shall, of course, be interested in evidences of priority, and any possible light on relative dates. I shall presume, as a starting point at least, the unity of authorship of Isaiah 40-66, though we shall be very interested in differences in attitude toward the Pentateuch which may be revealed as between the earlier and later chapters.

CHAPTER II

A COMPARISON OF IDEAS

A. The Creation: an Exilic Concept

It is fitting to start our comparison of Second Isaiah and the Pentateuch with the consideration of an idea which, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, may be considered the literary child of either Second Isaiah or the Priestly editor of the Pentateuch. No prophet before the exile emphasized the Creation.[1] D and E begin their accounts with the call of the Hebrew nation, and Gen. 2 (J or S) mentions the creation of the heavens and earth (2:4b) only by way of giving an early date to the making of mankind.[2]

---

[1] The retrospective "since the days that God created man on the earth" of Deut. 4:32 is scarcely sufficient to disqualify this statement, even presuming an early date. See discussion of this verse, sq. p. 12,24.

[2] The creation idea is, for instance, important with the Psalmists (e.g., Ps. 8,19,33,51,89,95,96, 102,104,148, etc.) But we cannot even take up the speculation that any of these are pre-exilic (see M. Buttenwieser, The Psalms, in loc., re Ps. 104.) We also assume the traditional post-exilic date for Job, e.g. chapters 9, 26,38, Pfeiffer (IOT, p. 677) and others notwithstanding.

The earliest Hebrew religious ideas as represented in Joshua and Judges were of God acting here and now in the lives of his people. With the acquisition of a literature, there developed also the historic sense,

The systematic Priestly editor, as well as the prophet-poet we know as Second Isaiah, were from an era when men were learning to think beyond narrow nationalistic perspectives. The Creation idea was necessary to the thought of each. But historically there are several possibilities regarding the adoption of this concept as a major addition to Hebrew religious thought. We know the Babylonian Tiamat myth from Babylonian sources, and that it permeated Babylonian literature at the time of the exile.[1] A similar nature myth was certainly prevalent in Palestine, and J (and S) undoubtedly originally contained versions of it.

---

and the J and E writers presented the story of God working in the history of his people over a period of time. Balancing this we may perceive an embryonic exchatology involved in the promises to the Patriarchs and the Day of Yahweh of the earlier prophets. It is not until the time of the exile that Israel's writers seem to have achieved the breadth of viewpoint that demanded a consideration of the idea of creation and the balancing development of a real eschatology. In Second Isaiah the idea of the trek into Palestine is frequently balanced against the contemplated exodus from Babylon. A person of Second Isaiah's literary and historical genius could be expected consciously to maintain this balance between God's working in the past and his promise for the future, and both of these in relation to his imminent action in the lives of his people here and now.

[1]Hirsch sees the floods and darkness of the Babylonian winter in the primeval watery chaos of Gen.1 (HERE IV, p. 152 ff.) In the Spring the waters are divided by the winds. The primeval waters, the great unlit waters of darkness, are symbolized by Tiamat (תְּהוֹם). According to the Babylonian inscriptions, sons were born to Tiamat: these were the gods. There is a battle between the Tiamat forces and the forces of light.

To completely unravel the mythologies behind the various sources is quite beyond us.[1] These Palestinian tales, however, were probably the sort of myth one finds universally as an accompaniment to the stories of the first man, or the great flood[2] -- not the abstract concept which both Second Isaiah and Gen. 1 strive to express.[3] In their

---

Marduk, at a feast of the gods, drives a bargain that, in return for his slaying Tiamat (Rahab) he is to be first among them. He slays the dragon, making from its body: Heavens, heavenly bodies, earth, plants, animals, man. The purpose of man was to have someone to minister to the gods. Geo. W. Gilmore ("Creation", New Shaf-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge III, p. 296) sees a sort of primitive trinity in the Babylonian chaos of Apsu, Mummu and Tiamat. To this others have added the identification of "salt water, fresh water and the Word."

Skinner (Genesis, ICC, p. 17) says, "In the Babylonian Creation-myth the primal chaos is personified under the name Tiamat. The Hebrew narrative (Gen. 1) is free from mythological associations, and it is doubtful if even a trace of personification lingers in the name תְּהוֹם." Pfeiffer (IOT, p. 36) says: "The Babylonian myth of creation according to which the god Marduk slew the dragon Tiamat and out of the two halves of her body formed heaven and earth, is occassionally referred to in Job, Psalm 104, and later poetical writings. Tiamat is called Rahab (Job 9:13, 26:12; Ps. 89:10; Is. 51:9 f.; Ecclus. 43:23); Leviathan (Ps. 74:13; Is. 27:1; cf. Job 3:8, 41:1 ff.; Ps. 104:26) or the dragon (Job 7:12; Is. 27:1; 51:9; Ez. 29:3 ff., 32:2 ff.) Needless to say, such mythological allusions were mere figures of speech, like our conversational references to Mars, Venus, and the Elysian Fields."

[1] Peters, "Cosmogony and Cosmology (Hebrew)" HERE IV, p. 152, expresses the conviction that Gen. 2 goes back to the primitive Babylonian myth (Eden, the cherubim, the tree of life) but is primarily Palestinian in origin. Cf. Job 7:12, 9:13, 26:6-12, 37:18, 38:7, c. 40, 41, Enoch 60:7-9. Pfeiffer would say South Palestinian (IOT, p. 160).

[2] J.G. Frazer, Folklore in the O.T., p. 1-15, 46-142.

[3] The cosmic egg idea (from Egypt via Phoenecia?) may be evident in the "brooding" idea of Gen. 1 and Deut. 32:11. But the LXX translates instead ἐπεφέρετο

efforts both seem to make direct allusions to the Tiamat idea (Gen. 1:2, Is. 51:9) and however symbolic or literary the allusions, I think we are justified in presuming both were familiar with their origin.[1]

"was rushing upon". The eagle "rushes upon" its young to get them to fly.

Cf. J.M.P.Smith's "literal rendering" of Gen.1 (O.T. Essays, p. 169):

> In the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth having been a desolate waste, while darkness was upon the surface of the abyss and a mighty wind was beating upon the surface of the waters, then God said, "Let there be light", and there was light.

[1] E.G.Hirsch points out ("Cosmogony", JE IV, p. 280) that there are four possibilties for the similarities of the Babylonian and Hebrew "myths" and that evidence is not compulsive for any one to the exclusion of the others:

a. There may be a common Semitic tradition in back of both.

b. The stories may have come into Palestine with the early (Patriarchal) migrations.

c. They may have been made familiar to the Hebrews during the Babylonian captivity.

d. They may have been carried to Palestine long before the conquest and were gradually appropriated by the Hebrews after they came into the land.

This last is Gunkel's view and seems to have had rather wide acceptance. It is strengthened by the fact that it is quite impossible to imagine a people with as ingrained a religious consciousness as the Hebrews at the time of the captivity adopting a whole new set of creation myths while in Babylon, bringing them home, and then being able to impose them on the people who had remained in Palestine. Cf. W.O.E. Oesterley and T.H.Robinson, Hebrew Religion, p. 231:

> "While in some respects Babylonian culture influenced the Jews, it seems certain that Babylonian religion did not permanently affect them. It would be difficult to point to any essential doctrine or religious practice of Judaism of which it could be said that it was the result of Babylonian religious influence."

We must ask then:

1. Did each adapt it to Hebrew religious thought independently?

2. Did one "follow" the other in its adoption;

But the word of the prophets eloquently agrees with the archaeological evidence (which has uncovered such a wealth of cult materials everywhere in Palestine): prophetic religion was not the religion of the majority. And if the religion of the common people of Palestine was essentially the same as that of their neighbors, then it would not be strange for Yahweh to take on, during the exile, the coloring, ritual and termini technici of the Babylonian conception of Marduk.

This implies, of course, a different interpretation of what happened to Jewish religion during the exile than the accepted theory that it was entirely a time of repentance, reform and appreciation by all the Jewish people of the best in religion. Rather it would appear as a time of testing, out of which might evolve not one, but several answers, all of which might well be preserved in accordance with the Hebrew traditions of freedom of expression. See H. G. May, "A Key to the Interpretation of Zechariah's Visions", JBL LVII, p. 173-184. May sees, in the "man among the myrtles" Yahweh, appearing as Marduk.

Oesterley and Robinson, Hebrew Religion, p. 197, suggest that there was a distinctly Hebrew form of the Babylonian myth, claiming Yahweh as the Creator-god, and paralelling the Babylonian, though this form was never adopted by Hebrew theologians. There is no reason for denying this, but neither can I see any reason for affirming it, so far as the exilic or post-exilic writings are concerned. The people of Palestine certainly had a nature myth of this general pattern. It had taken every effort of the prophets to keep the people from abandoning themselves to it completely in the days before the exile.

E.G. Hirsch, "Cosmogony", JE IV, p. 280, says:

> "The comparatively late date of the literary documents has misled most of the modern commentators into the assumption that the early Hebrews were without a cosmogony. Gunkel (in Schöpfungsepos und Chaos)has demonstrated that the cosmogonic accounts or allusions thereto (techical archaic

if so, in which direction was the sequence? This question is by no means as simple as it might be if either man had been of a lower mental calibre. P would not have found Second Isaiah's work systematic enough, nor appropriate in other ways for direct use in his scheme, and as good a poet as Second Isaiah does not, as a rule, "copy" his ideas from others, but would make them his own before using them.

3. Was this idea not only familiar to both

---

terms like 'tohu wabohu', the use of words in an unusual sense, for instance רוח אלהים ; and mythological personifications like Rahab) display easlily discernible signs of incorporation of old material (Gen. 1:2; Job 26:12, 40:25, 41:26; Ps. 40:5, 74:12 ff., 87:4, 89:10; Is. 27:1, 51:9) . . . . . Gen. 1 certainly has the appearnace of a systematic presentation, but nevertheless it is not a free invention."

Similarly Peters, "Cosmogony and Cosmology" HERE IV, p. 152 ff. Cf. the discussion of S. Mowinckel and W. F. Albright, "The Babylonian Matter in the pre-Deuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11", JBL LVIII (1939), p. 87 ff. Mowinckel, arguing from the absence of Babylonian matter in J and its presence in E says:

"Stade was right when he said that this matter had come to Israel in a rather late period, in the Assyrian epoch." (Explaining similarities to the Ras Shamra materials), "In them the mythical-mystical identity of the victory over the ocean (the serpent) and the creation is only presupposed. In other words: the act of creation is only conceived as a mythical act and expressed in mythical-poetical terms; it has not (yet) been seen as an historical act and rationalized as a result of the (mythological) fight, and as following after this, such as in Israel."

Albright says:

"The cosmogonic elements and thesagas imbedded in the extra-Priestly parts of Gen. 1-11 go back mainly to

but perhaps even consciously discussed between them? Were their works two different responses to a recognized need among the Jews of the period of the captivity for perpetuating their religious thinking in an "accepted" literature? And may there be other responses to that demand, also preserved for us?

The root בָּרָא , create, occurs twenty times in Second Isaiah; also in Gen. 1:1, 21,27 (3 times), 2:3,4, 5:1,2, 6:7 (all P).[1] Skinner, speaking of its use by Second Isaiah, finds it "significant not only of the writer's theology, but of the great movement of religious thought in Israel about the time of the captivity."[2]

---

pre-Israelite times, perhaps even to the first half of the second millennium B.C., in substantially their present forms . . . . . The latest elements in Gen. 10 belong to the period between the tenth and seventh centuries, but even here include references to much older sagas."

H.G. May, "Creation of Light in Gen. 1:3-5", JBL LVIII (1939), p. 203 ff., sees, with other scholars, two "recessions", an "acts" and a "words" version (F. Schwally, M. Lambert, and J. Morgenstern). Lambert and Morgenstern place the Sabbath framework in the acts version, but May, contra, says the acts version is pre-exilic (cf. Jer. 4:23-26), the words version and the Sabbath framework later.

[1] Not elsewhere in earlier literature. Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 194, says Ex. 34:10 and Nu. 16:30 use the word in another connotation and that both are late inserts (after 550). Deut. 4:32 is presumed as late; see p. 25 n.

[2] Isaiah ., p. 12.

Certainly the importance given to the creation story by P has more than chronological significance behind it: its place at the very beginning of the Pentateuch means more to the form-conscious Hebrew writer than simply that it "happened first." "No other language, " says Skinner,"possesses a word so exclusively appropriated to divine activity (as בָּרָא). Although it may not express the metaphysical idea of creation ex nihilo, it certainly denotes effortless production, by a bare volition, which is the manner of God's working."[1]

Other authorities suggest an etymology implying "cut out and put into shape", but this is scarcely apparent in either P's or Second Isaiah's usage, though it might go with the latter's curtain metaphor... It is less appropriate with P's "tohu wabohu".

It is strange that Ezekiel does not use the word in this sense at all, nor does he seem to concern himself

---

[1] Isaiah, ., p. 12. Cf. H. Schultz, O.T. Theology II, p. 186. Schultz, following Ewald, Bunsen, Schrader and others, translates, "in the beginning, when God created. . . . ." "Hence", he maintains,"there is nothing stated here about the origin of matter." (Objecting to Wellhausen's change of vowels to בָּרָא.) J.M.P.Smith, in O.T. Essays, p. 169, finds בָּרָא cannot hold the ex nihilo idea. (Following Bevan, Cambridge Journal of Philology XXIX, p. 263 ff.) Smith says, "The materials for his creation lay ready to hand, but in a chaotic state; his great task was to bring order out of chaos. In this respect, therefore, as in others, the Hebrew account of creation went back to its Babylonian predecessor (Apsu and Tiamat) for its start."

with the idea.[1] Stranger still, we do not find it in Job.[2] Creation is, of course, a favorite concept with the Psalmists.[3] Duhm makes the important passage in Amos 4:13 secondary.[4]

In his presentation of the creation idea, Second Isaiah ignores the systematic program so evident in Gen. 1, and which P apparently adopted from a similar Babylonian scheme, or schemes.[5] If he knew Gen. 1, he must have rather consciously ignored it. There seems no evidence here of dependence on either side, unless it be the negative evidence of possible protest on the part of Second Isaiah, which will be discussed later. The use of the creation idea or even of the word בָּרָא by both is not in itself significant of such a relationship, when the idea was so dominant in Babylon. Nor does an examination of the typical creation passages from Second

---

[1] 21:30 and 28:13,15 all refer to the creation of man.

[2] An argument for an early date?

[3] Ps. 51:10, 89:12, 102:18, 104:30, 148:5.

[4] B. Duhm, The Twelve Prophets, p. 65. See also Dt. 4:32 (Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 186 says this is "an echo of Is. 45:12"), Jer. 31:22, Mal. 2:10, Ecc. 12:1. These are the only other appearances of the root בָּרָא in the O.T.

[5] Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 192, discusses the discrepancy between P's own system and the source which he used: crowding eight (nine if we count the creation of man) creative acts into six days. See also H.G. May's article referred to ante, p. 10.

Isaiah yield much in the way of verbal correspondences with P.[1]

---

[1]The following are the principal passages to be noted:

40:21 f.: Have you not understood since the foundations of the earth?
It is he who sits enthroned above the circle of the earth,
So high that its inhabitants are like grasshoppers;
Who stretches out the heavens like a curtain,
And spreads them like a tent to dwell in.

40:26: Lift up your eyes on high,
And see! Who created these?
He brought forth their hosts by number,
And called them all by name;
Through the greatness of his might,
And the strength of his power,
Not one is missing.

40:28: The Lord is a God everlasting,
The Creator of the ends of the earth.

41:20: That men may see and know . . . . .
That the Holy One of Israel has created it.

42:5: Thus saith the Lord God
Who created the heavens and stretched them out,
Who made the earth and its products,
Who gives breath to the people upon it,
And spirit to those who walk in it.

44:24: I, the Lord, the maker of all,
Who stretched out the heavens alone,
Who laid out the earth -- who was with me?

45:7: Who forms light and creates darkness,
Who makes weal and creates woe.

45:8: Pour down, O heavens, cause righteousness to spring up,
Since I, the Lord, have created it.

45:12: I made the earth,
And created man upon it,
My hand stretched out the heavens,
And all their host I marshaled.

The "curtain" simile, for instance (40:22, 42:5, 44:24, 45:12, 48:13, 51:13, 51:16) which has been termed "characteristic" of Second Isaiah finds no counterpart in either P or in the early literature of the Old Testament.[1] The same is true of the mentions of the world's "foundations" (40:21, 44:24, 48:13, 51:13, 51:16).[2] As to the marshalling of the heavenly host (40:26, 45:12, 48:13),[3] it would be

---

45:18: For thus saith the Lord who created the heavens
-- He is the God--
Who formed the earth and made it
-- He established it--
He did not create it a chaos he formed it a dwelling place.

48:13: My hand laid the foundations of the earth,
My right hand spread out the heavens:
When I call them, they stand up together.

51:13: Why should you forget the Lord your maker
Who stretched out the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth?

51:15 f.: For I, the Lord, am your God,
Who stirred up the sea, so that its billows roar--
The Lord of Hosts is his name--
And I put my words in your mouth,
And hid you in the shadow of my hand,
When I stretched out the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth,
And said to Zion, "You are my people".

[1] Cf. Job 9:8, Zech. 12:1, Ps. 104:2

[2] Cf. Job 38:4 ff.

[3] Cf. Ps. 103, 147:4, Job 38:4, Enoch 43:1, Bar. 3:35, etc.

altogether too far-fetched to find a significant parallel in Gen. 1:14. Torrey rightly says (concerning Is. 40:22) that "any modern poet might use the same figures" and that we can tell nothing of the cosmology of the writer from such a passage.[1]

The emphasis on the fact that all this is done to make a dwelling place for man (40:22, 45:18) is in line with Gen. 2. Man is not, as with P, the final act of creation. Nor is he, as in the Babylonian parallel, an afterthought, created to serve the gods. He is, as a matter of fact, the reason for all this activity (40:21, 45:18 f., cf. 44:24, 51:13, 57:15), just as in Gen. 2.

Even more convincing is an examination of the larger units as a whole in which Second Isaiah and P deal with this theme of creation. P, in Gen. 1, gives us an etiological masterpiece, quite possibly in liturgical form, dealing with the very Creation of the universe as a basis for the Sabbath. Second Isaiah is not so interested in a systematic cosmology as in telling of Yahweh's glory and concern for man. He must go to the beginnings and ends of time for his evidence. Not the creation as an event, but Yahweh as Creator, is his emphasis. The event of creation is the supreme evidence

---

[1] C.C.Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 308.

of the incomparableness of Yahweh: only Yahweh could create a universe.

We have mentioned the possibility of an element of protest in Second Isaish, and we must note evidences of it here, before going on to another group of passages. Yahweh is not Marduk, contending in the abyss on behalf of the forces of light (48:2:"My glory I give to no other!") He, himself, created both light and darkness, weal and woe (45:7).[1] God did not create the world a

---

[1] Who forms light, and creates darkness,
Who makes weal, and creates woe;-
I the Lord am he who does all these things.

To take the first line as a direct reference to Gen. 1:3 f., leaves no explanation of the paralellism of the second line. The point of the Genesis account is not that God created light and darkness and found light alone good, but that from primordial darkness he created day, and found it, like all his creations, good. Theoretically, this is not dualism, since the residual chaos seems inert. But it surely opens the way for dualistic thinking. T.K. Cheyne, (Prophecies of Isaiah I, p.294) says the Second Isaiah passage cannot be a protest against Persian dualism, since Persian thought was not yet dualistic (a point open to debate) but that it may be "against the primitive dualism of Babylon." H.G. May, Op.cit,, p.209, says: "The emphasis on Yahweh as creator of light and darkness, as it appears, for instance, in Is. 45:7, may have come partially as a reaction against Babylonian or Persian dualism": Yahweh is both Ahuramazda and Ahriman? In eschatological thinking, Yahweh becomes the source of light. In Isaiah 60, "the nations shall walk in his light, and kings in the brightness of his rising."

chaos but made it a dwelling place(45:18 f.).[1] He alone accomplished all this (44:24). His word blasts as well as creates (40:30).[2]

There seems a strong element of protest here, though lack of verbal correspondences is evidence against the protest being directly against P. But Second Isaiah is writing for the Hebrew people (40:1 ff.) and his protest is not against the religion of Babylon as such, but against its confusion with Yahwism. He makes the same stand for thepurity of the Hebrew religion that was made by the early prophets, when the threat was of syncretism between Yahweh and Baal.

---

[1] T.K. Cheyne (Prophecies I, p. 299) thinks 45:19,

> I spoke not in secret
> In a land of darkness.
> I said not to Jacob's descendents
> "Seek me in chaos,"

"supplements the words of Moses in Dt. 30:11 f., and declares that Yahweh's Torah or prophetic revelation is not to be obtained by occult arts from Sheol or the underworld." Cf. the similar phraseology, Job 10:21, Ps. 88:12. I am not inclined to see the connection with the Deuteronomy passage nor to agree with Cheyne's interpretation. Whether the passage suggests a preference for J or S over P will have to be considered. Certainly the negative form of the statement suggests that someone worthy an answer has advanced the chaos idea, and we suspect he may mean the author of Gen. 1. But as has been pointed out, Gen. 1 does not say God created the chaos. Protest against the chaos idea is even more evident in 45:18. The point that he "formed it for a dwelling place", is in line with Gen. 2. The thought occurs that Second Isaiah's influence may have had something to do with the inclusion of the non-Priestly Gen. 2-11 materials in the Pentateuch, if they really are a post-P addition.

[2] See T.K. Cheyne's note contrasting "rebuke" and "create", Prophecies II, p. 25.

Second Isaiah is protesting against the adoption of practices and terminologies which are creeping into the very inner circles of Yahwism. Dualism, ritualism and numerology must not become incorporated into the prophetic religion of Israel as its heritage from the days of the exile.

But our data so far examined does not warrant our saying whether that protest was against a tendency which continued in spite of his words and later influenced the Priestly Code, or whether it was against such tendencies as he saw them already embodied in the Pentateuch.

Our conviction that Second Isaiah is interested in the nature of God rather than in establishing an acceptable cosmogony finds support in another group of creation passages in Second Isaiah, passages which we have not yet cited and in which the emphasis is distinctly upon the creation of the nation Israel rather than on the universe: [1] 43:1, 7, 15; 44:2, 45:11.

---

[1]

43:1: the Lord
Who created you, O Israel.

43:7: Everyone who is called by my name
Whom I have created and formed,
And made for my glory.

43:15: I, the Creator of Israel, am your king.

44:2 the Lord your maker,
Who formed you from the womb. (to Jeshurun)

It is interesting to note that these references to God as the creator of Israel all occur in the literary unit c. 43-45, of which the history and redemption of Israel itself, as evidence of Yahweh's omnipotence, is the theme. In other words, so permeated is Second Isaiah's thought with the idea of the Creator God, that he naturally applies it to the specific topic upon which he is writing. 43:1 sets forth the viewpoint from which he is now going to review the nation's history. In these chapters, as elsewhere in Second Isaiah, God is the creator of the heavens and the earth and of all mankind (44:24, 45:12). But now we are talking about Israel's history, hence the idea is applied specifically to that field.[1] We may, then, disregard any arguments for a particularistic viewpoint which might be adduced from these passages.

For P, on the other hand, the story of the creation is necessary background for the history of Israel and specifically for the institution of the Hebrew Sabbath.

45:11: Thus saith the Lord
The Holy One of Israel, who formed it,
"Will you question me concerning my children,
Or give me orders regarding the work of my hands?"

[1]Cf. the servant song of 49:1-6, where the expression "he formed me **from** the womb to be his servant" seems to carry the creation idea on to the individual, though perhaps Second Isaiah was just borrowing the thought from Jeremiah. Cf. Is. 45:9 ff.: Woe to him who strives with his maker, etc.

Correct worship is the reason for creation: a thought entirely in line with the Babylonian concept that man was an afterthought of creation, made especially to wait upon the gods.

But although P is, equally with Second Isaiah, interested in both the Creation and the history of Israel, he never combines the two thoughts in quite the same way that Second Isaiah does. P never speaks of the creation of Israel as such: for him the Creation is the prelude to Israel's history. There is no indication that P could think of Creation as a continuing process. Koehler's conception that the creation idea is at its basis eschatological[1] must be based on Second Isaiah rather than upon the Pentateuch.

It seems that Second Isaiah pushes the thought of creation somewhat further than P, and that the latter might have found the application of the term to Israel itself congenial, had he known Second Isaiah's writings. But such a negative type of evidence for P's priority has little weight unless we find it substantiated by further evidence of a more compulsive character.

To come now specifically to the question of the Tiamat (Rahab) myth,[2] there is little question of its having

---

[1] Ludwig Koehler, Theologie des Alten Testaments, p. 71.

[2] No comparison of the creation idea in Second Isaiah

been known to both P and Second Isaiah, but lack of verbal correspondences points to a common source rather than dependence. It is a common source of which neither approved, but with which each realized he had to deal.

The P code was (as Deuteronomy had been in its day) an attempt to stabilize and thus retain such gains as prophetic religion had made. The P writer's creation account was supposed to supplant -- or more properly to eliminate the appeal of -- the Babylonian nature myth. P's use of the point-by-point scheme of creation and such "technical" terms as "chaos and desolation" or "divide"[1] crept in from the cultural environment in which he lived and remained as evidence for the modern scholar.

J.P.Peters rightly says:

---

and the Pentateuch would be complete without special mention of the word תהום . תהום ובהו of Gen. 1:2 is probably a technical term taken over from the Babylonian (so J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena III, p. 305.) It occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament only in the frequently deleted Jer. 4:23. The word תהום occurs alone eight times in Second Isaiah. Of the ten other occurences of the word (Deut. 32:10, Jer. 4:23, Is. 24:10, 29:21, 34:11, Ps. 107:40, Job 6:18, 12:24, 26:7, I Sam. 12:21) Cheyne (Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, p. 253) says only Jeremiah could be pre-exilic and this is doubtful.

[1] בדל is used by Second Isaiah twice (56:3 and 59:2.) The former passage has no special significance for us, but Cheyne points out that the use in 59:2 (a hiphil participle) exactly parallels Gen. 1:6 except that the use in Genesis is plural. He refers to ZATW 1:248, Wellhausen, Prol., p. 406 and Driver in Journal of Philology 11:219 for further discussion. The word occurs four times in pre-exilic literature, twenty times in later writings. (Cheyne, Introduction, p. 260 f.)

> "The cosmology of Gen. 1:2-4, lofty as it is in its monotheistic conception of the power of God, did not reach the highest limits of Hebrew thought. Hampered by the old myths, it stood perilously near dualism in reckoning chaos, darkness and the deep as existing independently of God and eternity."[1]

He continues that "Deutero-Isaiah was familiar with the popular cosmogonic myths, and apparently also with the formal cosmogony ultimately formulated in Gen. 1:2-4."[2] With this I agree, but I find no evidence, so far in our investigation, that he knew Gen. 1 as it now stands, which I think Peters is implying. Both could have been written concurrently to the same situation. I am inclined to feel that failure to consider this possibility has contributed to the sharp differences of opinion in regard to the dating of Second Isaiah. Pfeiffer, for instance, recognizes the tension between the two writers, but gives Second Isaiah priority.[3]

Psychologically, Second Isaiah showed a better understanding of his people's problems. He did not deny the existence of a nature religion, nor ignore it, but presented prophetic religion as something obviously better. The constant reiteration of Yahweh's supremecy in chapters 43-45 becomes particularly meaningful in such a context.(See 43:3, 11, 15f., 25; 44:6; 45:5, 7, 18.)

---

[1] Op. cit. , p. 155

[2] Ibid.

[3] IOT, p. 196.

Just as Hosea and even Elijah had pointed out long before that Yahweh, not Baal, was in control of fertility, so now Second Isaiah told his people that Yahweh was not only the soverign Lord of history as they had understood it in its nationalistic implications, but the supreme power behind the very cosmic forces of the universe-- forces which the Babylonians had lamely explained in terms of the Tiamat myth.

Regarding the reference to Tiamat in Is. 51:9, Gunkel points out that "the Hebrew poets were fond of using this old myth to symbolize the destruction of Israel's enemies." Representing victory over the primeval waters, it was natural to use the term symbolically in regard to the drying up of the Red Sea (Is. 51:9)[1] or the hemming in of the Nile (Ezek. 29:3).[2]

To take Cheyne's interpretation that there is an allusion here to the heavenly conflict between the powers of light and darkness, ascribes to Second Isaiah a dualistic thought pattern which he consistently denies.[3]

---

[1] A comparison with 43:14-17, in context, makes it obvious that this is the type of allusion here. We are not discussing the creation at this point, but Yahweh working in history, and the poet uses the symbol for the power of the waters which was familiar to everyone. Like P's seven-point program and his "tohu and wohu", the reference is evidence concerning Second Isaiah's cultural environment rather than his cosmogony or theology.

[2] H. Gunkel, "Dragon", JE IV, p. 648; similarly C. C. Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 399.

[3] Prophecies II, p. 31. Cf. 40:30, 44:24, 48:2. See

Although the obvious affinity of the creation idea in Second Isaiah is with Gen. 1, probably the closest verbal relationship is between Is. 45:12 and Deut. 4:32. The conviction that Deuteronomy's "since the day that God created man on the earth" is directly related to Second Isaiah's "I made the earth and created man upon it," is strengthened by the Hebrew:

Is. 45:12: אָנֹכִי עָשִׂיתִי אֶרֶץ וְאָדָם עָלֶיהָ בָּרָאתִי

Deut. 4:32: אֲשֶׁר בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אָדָם עַל־ הָאָרֶץ

Also, both couple the thought with that of the breadth of the heaven. The one other occurence of the phrase "on the earth" in connection with the creation of man is surprising, and will prove interesting in the light of later findings: Gen. 6:6:

> And the Lord repented that he had made man on the earth. . . . .(and said) "I will blot the men that I have created off the face of the ground."

Hebrew vocabulary is remarkably similar for the three passages.[1] The fact that the Deuteronomy passage seems to refer to an accepted fact or time, rather than giving "first hand" information makes it seem more probably secondary to the Gen. 6 passage. I think this is true in spite of the negative form of the latter, in which we sense that the first part of the story may well be

---

also Peters, Op. cit., p. 156.

[1] Note the absence of the אֵת after בָּרָא in both passages. P always uses the אֵת with בָּרָא (n.b. Gen. 1:27). Its absence in the Second Isaiah passage could be accounted for by the poetic form. Gesenius, par. 117, calls attention to the fact that the poetic (archaic) form often omits the אֵת, and that it is never used in Ex. 15:2-18, Deut. 32, Jud. 5, I Sam. 2, Gen. 49 (except v. 15) Deut. 33 (except v. 9). But the Deut. 4:32 passage is prose, which would suggest dependence on Second Isaiah, since use of the אֵת would be normal prose usage with any verb and a definite object. That Deuteronomy has no aversion to it is evident from its use with עָוַר (v. 26) and כָּלָה (v. 31).

missing, but that what we have is original enough, and whether called S or J will generally be conceded as the earliest of the three passages under discussion.

The coupling of the idea that "God created man on the earth" with the "stretching out of the heavens" in both Second Isaiah and the Deuteronomy passage, indicates dependence one way or the other between them, rather than pointing to Gen. 6 as a common source, although we might allow the possibility that such an idea could have been present in deleted portions of the original document.

The use of the two verbs עשה and בראׁ seems to bring the Second Isaiah passage closer to the Genesis one, which also uses both. Deuteronomy combines "making" the earth and "creating" man upon it, into "creating man on the earth".[1]

I therefore suggest that there is a definite literary relationship between these three passages, and that the probable sequence is Gen. 6, Second Isaiah, Deut. 4.[2]

---

[1] A third word כונן , establish, is used by Second Isaiah in connection with the creation, 45:18, 51:13, Cf. the use "establish" Jerusalem, 62:7. This word is used nowhere else in prophecy, though very frequent in Psalms and other late literature. Cf. Dt. 32:6: Hath he not made thee and established thee? I think there is no early evidence of it implying the idea of the Creation.

[2] S. R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, p. 72, makes Dt. 4:32 original D material, but Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 185, says Dt. 4 is a post-exilic addition.

Our conclusions, then, so far, are:

1. Second Isaiah and P both lived in an environment so permeated with the chaos dragon myth that its terminology became part of their vocabulary, its symbols part of their literary equipment, even as each, in his own way, rebelled, consciously, against the religion it represented and its possible influence on Judaism.

2. There is no compulsive evidence so far of Second Isaiah's familiarity with Gen. 1 nor vica versa. This does not, of course, preclude the possibility.

3. The element of protest in Second Isaiah may be against Babylonian influences, to the threat of which it may have seemed to him P's presentation would leave the door open.

4. Second Isaiah's thought of God as Creator of Israel is not adopted by P, who thinks of the Creation rather as an event preliminary to Israel's history. P either did not know or did not follow Second Isaiah's thought in chapters 43-45. Since we would have expected such thought to be congenial to P, his failure to adopt it may be slight evidence that he was not acquainted with it.

5. There seems a convincing verbal relationship between Gen. 6:6, Is.45:12 and Deut. 4:32, with this their probable sequence.

---

[1] Possibly Is. 52:8, "For eye to eye shall they see when the Lord restores Zion," reflects controversy in Babylon instead of referring , as Cheyne thinks (Prophecies II, p. 37), to the heavenly watchers.

B. The Exodus: A Concept Common to All Sources

There is no Hebrew literary property more common to all sources than the Exodus. In a locality so constantly subject to new immigrations, this was only natural. The story of a trek from a distant land is one of the most frequently recurring themes in primitive folklore, and here in Palestine it had historic basis in the experience of many diverse elements of the population. Out of the many tales they told evolved the story of the Exodus[1] as we find it in the Pentateuch, centering in the deliverence of the Hebrew children from bondage in the land of Egypt. The migration theme is not missing from any of the main Pentateuchal strands, and for this reason it may be especially interesting to see if we can find evidence of direct literary relationship between Second Isaiah and any of the earlier sources.[2]

---

[1] Cf. the similar literary phenomenon described by H. G. May, "Evolution of the Joseph Story", AJSL XLVII (1931) p. 83.

[2] The extent to which Second Isaiah drew upon the theme of the beginning of Israel's history in the wilderness as a basis for his eschatology for the future is evident from his references to the "transformed wilderness" (40:3-5, 41:18 f., 42:11, 43:19-21, 44:3-4, 48:20-22, 49:9-10, 51:3, 51:10-11, 55:12-13), Israel's return from the four corners of the world (43:5-7, 43:14-21, 49:12 in context, 49:22-23, 60:3-4, 60:9, 66:19-21), the path through the sea (43:16-17, 44:27, 50:2, 51:9-10, 55:12-13), the highway in the desert (40:3-4, 42:16, 43:19, 48:21, 49:9-11, cf. 51:10-11, 55:12, 57:14, 60:10-12, 63:13, 66:20).

There is no motif of which Second Isaiah is more fond than the balancing of the proposed return against the history of the trek into Palestine. But his literary sense and his poetic imagination must have been highly important factors in the selection of his terminology and mode of expression. So we must be careful not to see too many analogies where they do not exist. In 40:3, for instance:

> In the wilderness clear the way of the Lord, [1]
> Make straight in the desert a highway for our God,

---

[1]This passage opens up the whole controversial matter of whether this and such comparable passages as 49:11, 57:14, 62:10 (and Torrey adds 35:8) are to be taken with a degree of literalness or are purely metaphorical. Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 305, speaks of the poet's "dwelling on the figure of the desert" as a "pure abstraction" with its basis in Israel's traditions.

> "The prophet dwells frequently on his figure of the desert for two reasons: first, it represents the hinderances and difficulties in the way of the returning Jews of the Dispersion; and again, it gave him the opportunity to depict, in a most striking way (as just before, in 35:8 ff.) God's loving care and guidance of his people, especially since the old traditions of the journey from Egypt to the promised land (cf. Deut. 2:7, 8:2-4,15 f., Amos 3:1-2, Hos. 13:5, etc.) were among the most precious religious posessions of Israel. This latter reason was the principal one; notice especially his use of the return from Egypt in 43:16 f.; 48:21; 63:11 ff."

Cheyne, Prophecies I, p. 244, likewise sees in this verse and similar ones a "grand poetic symbol" and "an allusion to the journey through the desert at the Exodus, Egypt being typical of Babylon" (48:21, 52:12). (Forgetting that he himself repudiates the one verse in Second Isaiah mentioning Egypt in connection with the Exodus? See sq.)

the author probably was thinking of the return in terms of the invasion, as is commonly supposed, but to suggest definite relationships between accounts of the desert wanderings and such mention of the wilderness is completely unjustifiable. Unless a person comes by boat, he has to cross the desert to get to Palestine. Nor is the mere mention of water or the Lord providing it on a journey in itself evidence of relationship to some source that reported similar phenomena.[1] It seems the natural thing to expect the Lord to provide water for his charges

---

Skinner says the figure is from the practice of preparing roads for a royal journey, and that the allusions to the march through the desert are too frequent to be merely figurative (40:10 f., 41:18 f., 42:16, 43:19 f., 48:21, 54:9 f., 55:12 f.) He thinks the prophet expected deliverance in a triumphant procession similar to the one from Egypt, but that he also looked beyond the material fulfilment of this dream and was thinking of the removal of political and other obstacles as well. This is to be the consumation, as the journey from Egypt was the beginning. (J. Skinner, Isaiah XL-LXVI -- Cambridge Bible, p. 1.)

Stamm, J.J., Erlösen und Vergeben im A.T., p.39, contrasts a deliverance "grounded in the existence of the historical people of Israel" with those "liberated from sin at the end of time."

Certainly the reference is not definite enough to refer the passage to any particular version of the Exodus story. Comparison with certain other passages, in fact, cautions against such emphasis on the wilderness idea. A way is also to be made through the mountains (49:11) and through the gates (62:10).

[1]Note that Yahweh's ability to dry up the waters is also evidence of his power, e.g., 44:27:

> Who says to the deep "be dry"!
> And all your streams will I drain. . . . .

on a trip through the desert.

I shall try to confine the discussion here to passages in which there seems to be definite reference to the Hebrew traditions of the beginning of the nation's history.

One passage which undeniably refers to this early tradition and which at the same time is generally conceded

---

or 42:15:

> I will lay waste mountains and hills,
> And will dry up all their herbage;
> I will turn rivers into deserts
> And dry up the pools.

Cf. 50:2. The reference to the fish dying is scarcely to Ex. 7:18. The above quotations seem to contrast with, e.g., 41:17 f.:

> When the poor and needy seek water in vain,
> And their tongue is parched with thirst,. . . . .
> I will open rivers on the bare heights,
> And wells in the midst of the valleys;
> I will make the wilderness a pool,
> And the parched land fountains of water.

We do not have to go to Horeb to find an interpretation. A torrential summer rain such as are common in Palestine would be regarded as a literal Godsend after a dry season in that thirsty land. Such activity is just one of the evidences of God's working in nature which will prove (41:20) -- eschatologically --

> That the hand of the Lord has done this,
> That the Holy One of Israel has created it.

Yahweh (not Marduk) is in control of the waters of the earth and provides it for the poor and needy of his people, when at last they turn to <u>him</u> for help. Note that he controls fire, too, and may use it to chastise man (42:25) or may protect man against its ravages (43:2).

as Second Isaiah's own, is 43:16-21.[1]

The Pentateuch account (Ex. 14-15) is so confused and composite that it is quite impossible to see any one source in the passage. Second Isaiah seems to refer to events with which the reader's familiarity is assumed. Granting the priority of J and E, there is little question that Second Isaiah either knew them in the Pentateuch or knew them as sources before they were worked over by P.

Let us examine some of the phrases in the Second Isaiah passage, and compare them with those from Exodus:

---

[1]
Thus saith the Lord,
Who made a way through the sea,
A path through mighty waters;
Who led forth chariot and horse,
Army and warrior together --
And they lay down, and could not rise up,
They were extinguished and quenched like a wick;
"Remember not former things,
Nor pay heed to things long past.
Behold, I am doing a new thing,
Even now it is springing to light --
Do you not perceive it?
A way will I make in the wilderness,
And rivers in the desert,
The beasts of the field shall honor me,
And the jackals and ostriches,
Because I provided water in the wilderness,
And rivers in the desert
To give drink to my chosen people,
The people whom I formed formyself,
That they might recount my praise."

We should mention in passing that Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 339, says the word "fugitives" ברחים in 43:14 (cf. ברחו 48:20) is a word taken from Ex. 14:5 (J). He says the poet uses the word "flee" to carry out the parallel of the flight from Egypt. There is no real flight; it is only a literary touch.

Second Isaiah says:"a way through the sea, a path through the mighty waters."

J: Moses, at Yahweh's instigation, held his hand over the sea and the wind "turned the sea to dry ground" (Ex. 14:21).

E: "By the blast of thy nostrils the waters were piled up; The streams stood up like a heap, the floods were congealed in the heart of the sea" (Ex. 15:8).

P: (using an E source?) The Israelites "proceeded on dry ground right into the sea, the waters forming a wall for them, to right and left of them" (Ex. 14:22, cf. v. 29). Or, "the Israelites had walked through the middle of the sea on dry ground" (15:19).

Assigning a definite "source" for the Isaiah reference quite baffles us.

Again, in the above quoted passage, Second Isaiah speaks of "chariot and horse, army and warrior together."

J: Pharaoh "hitched up his chariot" (Ex. 14:6).

E: "horse and rider"(15:1), "chariots and army"(15:4).

P: Pharaoh's "horses and chariots, his cavalry and infantry"(14:9), "the horses of Pharaoh, with his chariotry and cavalry"(15:19).

Deut. 11:4 seems, like Second Isaiah, to refer to the general tradition: "Teach your children . . . . . what he did to the army of the Egyptians, to their horses and chariots, how he made the waters of the Red Sea engulf them."

(See also 5:6, 6:22, 7:15, 9:7, all from the second introduction.) But with this, as with earlier sources, there seems lack of direct relationship to Second Isaiah. The evidence is of a common tradition, known to all.

The admonition to "remember not former things" in the passage quoted is puzzling[1] in view of the fact that this is exactly what Second Isaiah is constantly doing. Cheyne says that, like Jeremiah (23:7-8), the prophet here "points to a time when the great manifestation of the living God shall no longer be the deliverance from Egypt, but the restoration of Israel from the "recesses of the earth'" (cf. Jer. 3:16-17.)[2] Of course neither Second Isaiah nor the closely related Deut. 32 "remember" Egypt, and it is possible that there is a degree of protest here against this phase of the accepted account. Not wonder-stories from the past, but the tremendous acts which he is about to perform in Israel's history, are to be considered the evidence of Yahweh's greatness. For that matter, Second Isaiah might well have asked, why bring the story of the captivity in Egypt into a presentation of Hebrew religion when that tradition was not common to all the Hebrew people?[3]

---

[1] Cf. 41:22, 42:9, 44:7, 46:9.

[2] Prophecies I, p. 278.

[3] Eduard Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme,

One must wonder at the relationship, if any, with Deut. 32:7:

> Remember the days of old,
> Review the years, age after age;
> Ask your father to inform you,
> Your elders to tell you.

This Deuteronomy passage is not followed by the Red Sea story, but tells how Yahweh found Israel in the wilderness and chose her as his own, while assigning the other nations to lesser deities. We must wait for further evidence of the close relationship between Second Isaiah and Deut. 32. Presuming a relationship between the two passages here cited, the positive admonition of Deuteronomy would have precedence over the negative form in Second Isaiah. But in 46:9 Second Isaiah has the positive form:

> Remember the former things of old,
> For it is I who am God and there is no other.

We must postpone discussion of relationship to Deut. 32 till we reach the section on this particular question, pausing here only to note similarities in the passages under discussion.

---

in 1906 called attention to a tradition, of which he found outcroppings here and there through the Pentateuch, which ignored the story of the Exodus from Egypt. This tradition carries the history of Israel directly back to Jacob. This tradition was known, Meyer thinks, to both J and E, and the two schools each had their own version, though neither is part of our present J or E narratives.

References to the "beasts of the field" in the passage under discussion at once recalls Job (e.g. chapter 40) with whom Second Isaiah shows so many points of contact..

Pfeiffer, who puts Job in the time of Jeremiah, or specifically 605-580 B.C.,[1] thinks a reaction against Job's idea that Yahweh is concerned for the beasts as much as for man (12:10) may be evident in P's contention that only man is made in God's image.[2] This seems too far-fetched: even presuming the early date for Job (which I do not concede) I doubt very much if P would have done the authors of Job so much honor. P was simply using the Babylonian rather than the Palestinian (S) form of the nature myth as background. Moreover, P does not seem to be making any particular protest in Gen. 1. It is an orderly, well thought out scheme which he presents. It is, however, as Pfeiffer well recognizes, a different scheme from that which furnished the background for Second Isaiah's writings.

---

[1] IOT, p. 677.

[2] Ibid, p. 196.

Perhaps it is not too early to suggest that Second Isaiah and Job both knew and used a source which P either did not know, or more probably knew and repudiated. Second Isaiah, on the other hand, favored this source, though he also knew and used both J and E, from which P drew so heavily. I submit that Pfeiffer's S (and S2) source, with the post-P date which he proposes for its inclusion in the Pentateuch, would meet the requirements.[1] Pfeiffer sees the use of S or S2 in Job, Ecclesiastes, and in both Second Isaiah and Ezekiel. Both of these prophets he dates in the sixth century. The question of relative dating is more fully discussed in the following section, when we consider the Flood story.

---

[1]This thesis was practically completed before the appearance of Pfeiffer's IOT. It has been a satisfaction to note that the requirements postulated by the needs of Second Isaiah for a different source than that represented by J and E, but not convincingly satisfied by J2, are rather perfectly met by his proposed post-P S. My original manuscript described a probable source with almost every characteristic of S as it occurs in Gen. 2-11. It did not, however, call for a southern locale. I have been inclined to connect this proposed source with the Noah literature which lies back of Enoch, and which was apparently of some antiquity. Could S be the Noah literature? It is interesting to find confirmation of S's connection with Second Isaiah in such minor matters as, e.g., this attitude toward animals.

The extent to which this thesis has been revised in the light of Pfeiffer's new book is apparent in the footnotes.

A way will I make in the wilderness
And rivers in the desert

seems to refer to the bringing of the water from the rock at Horeb. This is referred to in Ex. 17:6 (E), Nu. 20:11 (P), and Deut. 8:15. Cf. the waters of Marah (Ex. 15:22 - J) and of Beer (Nu. 21:16 - JE). Familiarity with E would be sufficient to account for the lines here but we shall presently discuss the matter further in regard to Is. 48:21, where the reference is more definitely to Horeb.

We should note here, however, that the Hebrew word which Second Isaiah uses for "desert" is יְשִׁמּוֹן an utterly barren and arid region, making the miraculous character of the event uncontestable, and that this is the same word used in Deut. 32:10:

He (Yahweh) found them in a desert land,
In the howling waste of a wilderness.

The same word occurs frequently in Psalms. In Nu. 21:19 (JE) and I Sam. 26:1, it seems to be a proper noun,[1] from which it seems likely later usage was derived. It is distinguished from מִדְבָּר, a place affording only scant grazing ground (as used in Deut. 8:15.) Again, see the later section on relationships to Deut. 32.

---

[1] Skinner, Isaiah, p. 42. But T. J. Meek translates "desert" in the Numbers passage. Waterman has "Desolate Waste" in Samuel (Chicago translation).

We have mentioned the fact that providing

rivers in the desert
To give drink to my chosen people

would be a natural way to expect God to manifest his power in a desert country, and is too general to be assigned to any source.

The "chosen people" idea seems to come from Deuteronomy (4:37, 7:6, 10:15, 14:2). In the first of these passages it is coupled with the idea of the Exodus:

> Because he loved your fathers and chose their descendants after them, and in his own person brought you out of Egypt by his great power.

This usage of the word "choose" does not appear in other Pentateuchal sources than Deuteronomy, where it is "typical".[1] Nor is it common in other early writings,[2] though the idea is dominant. I am not sure how far we can claim direct relation to the first introduction to Deuteronomy from this chosen people passage. We probably will not feel justified in insistence on it, unless we find sufficient other evidence pointing in the same direction.

The motive assigned in the last lines of the Is. 43:16-21 passage:

> The people whom I formed for myself
> That they might recount my praise,

suggests Miriam's song (Ex. 15:2-E):

---

[1] So Driver, LOT, p. 100.

[2] See Is. 14:1.

The Lord is my strength and song, for he saved me;
He is my God whom I shall praise, my father's God
whom I shall extol.

The natural sequence is Deut. 10:21:

He is to be your praise and he your God, who has
performed for you these great and awful deeds.

The idea of "praise" as a motive of creation seems common from the time of Jeremiah on, and becomes a dominant note (as we might well expect) with the Psalms. Second Isaiah uses it frequentily (42:8,10,12; 43:21; 61:3, 11). The J passage, Gen. 29:35, gives Leah's

Now do I praise the Lord

as the origin of the name Judah, Judah meaning praise. (Cf. Gen 49:8 - J, Your brothers shall praise you, O Judah.) The word occurs Deut. 10:21, 26:19, 32:43. Lev. 19:24 (H) is provision for the praise-offering. P does not otherwise use the word. As used by Second Isaiah, we can credit no Pentateuchal source unless it be the Ex. 15:2 (E), Deut. 10:21 sequence, both of which, as here, couple the idea with the deliverance at the time of the Exodus.

Let us turn now to another passage. We have mentioned the reference to the cleft rock, quite generally conceded as original, in 48:21:

They thirsted not when he led them through deserts;
Water from the rock he caused to flow for them;
He cleft the rock and water gushed out.

This passage is important for our purpose, since we may compare it with both an E and a P passage recounting the

same event. The preference must certainly be given to the former, Ex. 17:6:

> I will station myself before you on the rock of Horeb,
> and when you strike the rock, water will gush out
> of it, so that the people may drink.

There is no condemnation in either of these passages of the striking of the rock, of which such a point is made in Nu. 20:8, Deut. 32:51 (both P). In E, God suggests striking the rock. In P, which gives a desert of Zin locale to the story, Moses' doing so results in his being denied entrance to the promised land. In Second Isaiah the subject is ignored: Moses is not mentioned in this relation; God cleaves the rock for his people.

Our next major reference on the general theme of the exodus or invasion occurs in Is. 51:9 f.:

> Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord!
> Awake as in the days of old, as in generations
> long gone!
> Was it not thou who didst hew Rahab in pieces,
> That didst pierce the dragon?
> Was it not thou who didst dry up the sea,
> The waters of the mighty deep;
> That didst make the depths of the sea a way
> For the redeemed to pass over?

The arm of the Lord, almost an hypostatization here, is coupled with the passing of the sea in Ex. 15:16 (E):

> Because of the greatness of thine arm
> they became dumb as stone,
> Until thy people, O Lord, passed over;
> Until the people whom thou didst acquire passed over.

This might be a direct reference, but not necessarily so.

Arm is the Semitic symbol of might. And control of the waters is the supreme example of Yahweh's might in Israel's history. One would expect to find the two ideas cpupled in literature. Still, this may be taken to add something to the growing weight of evidence that Second Isaiah knew E. (We have seen that he also knew Deuteronomic passages using E.) There seems no evidence here of familiarity with any other source than E nor any light on whether or not the E material had already been incorporated into the Pentateuch.

As has already been pointed out in the section on the Creation, this is not primarily a reference to the creation[1] but is merely taking Rahab as symbolic of the waters, control of which, Second Isaiah is constantly emphasizing, is in the hands of Yahweh.

Has anyone suggested that Second Isaiah perceives here that it is the one God Yahweh working not only in the history of every nation, but represented in the very mythology of every people? It is Yahweh's (not Marduk's) might that is represented in the mythology of Babylon. It is Yahweh's (not even one of his angel's) miraculous protection of those who trust him that is represented in the E story of the Red Sea. Yahweh, and Yahweh alone, has done all of this.

---

[1]But so Skinner, Isaiah, p. 110. Contra, Torrey, op. cit., p. 400. Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 31, sees possible reference to the cosmic conflict.

Our longest and most definite reference to the Exodus story is the much-questioned 63:8 ff.:

> He said,"Surely they are my people, sons who will
> not play me false;"
> So he became their savior in all their distress.
> It was no messenger or angel, but his own presence
> that saved them;
> In his love and pity he redeemed them;
> He took them up and carried them all the days of old.
> But they rebelled and grieved his holy spirit;
> So he turned to be their enemy and fought against them.
> Then one recalled the days of old, of Moses and his
> people.
> Where is he who brought up from the sea the shepherd
> of his flock?
> Where is he who put within him his holy spirit?
> He who caused his glorious arm to go at Moses'
> right hand;
> He who cleft the waters before them, to make himself
> an everlasting name;
> He who led them through the depths without stumbling,
> Like a horse through the steppe, like cattle going
> down to the valley?
> So did the spirit of the Lord guide them,
> So didst thou lead thy people, to make thyself
> a glorious name.

There is nothing here, I think, which cannot be referred to either a general familiarity with early Hebrew traditions, regardless of specific sources and with Deut. 32:1-43. The similarity to the latter is striking.[1]

---

[1] E.g.:

> Like an eagle . . . . .
> Spreading its wings to catch them,
> And carrying them on its pinions. . . . . (32:11)
>
> You neglected the very rock who bore you,
> And forgot the God who gave you birth. (32:18)
>
> The Lord alone was their leader,
> And no foreign god was with him. (32:12)

The thought of God actually turning against his people comes out forcibly in both passages, as does the motif of the necessity for self-vindication.

We cannot attempt to decide priority as between these passages now, but must wait for the section devoted to this relationship.

A similarity to Deut. 32 might turn out to be rather good evidence for the originality of the Second Isaiah passage, which has been quite generally subject to question.[1] Among many conjectures as to the passage, it may be in place to suggest that the author meant almost exactly what he said:

> And (when he sees) that it is being said,"Where is their God,
> The Rock in whom they sought refuge . . . . ." (32:37)

[1] Alike by those who do and do not distinguish a Trito-Isaiah. E.g., Volz, Eissfeldt, G.A. Smith, Duhm, and Cheyne (quoted Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 458); cf. G.E.Box, Book of Isaiah, p. 329; Driver seems to accept it as genuine. Those who reject it as Second Isaiah's own work make it a poem by a different author of a considerably later date. The fact that there is no particular desire on the part of any of these authorities to get rid of the mention of Moses makes their arguments, which move in that direction, all the more convincing that the name (if not the whole passage) is not Second Isaiah's, or, if we accept the emendation suggested by Saadya, Rashi, Hitzig, Ewald, Nagelsbach, Delitzsch and others (quoted Box, Ibid.), "then they remembered the ancient days of Moses" instead of "they recalled the days of old, of Moses and his people", that this is only a tradition to which he does not necessarily lend support.

Note that Sellin points out that the Moses of suppressed tradition was no wonder-worker and miracle man, but a shepherd-leader, as here(E. Sellin, Mose und seine Bedeutung, p. 81-113.)

Yahweh (no one else) cared for this people in the early days in the wilderness where the history of Israel began. But on coming into Palestine, a land of comparative plenty, they forgot him in favor of the baals of the land, and because of their apostasy many evils befell them. This is the story told in the Song of Moses and summarized in Is. 63:8-9. It seems to be the story which Second Isaiah prefers for the beginnings of the Hebrew nation, and whose vocabulary he uses in preference to that of Moses' wonder-working in Egypt and the varying accounts of Moses and Aaron at Sinai. "Then somebody began making a great deal of the story of Moses."[1] They put the "Song" and the Deuteronomic code both in a framework of Moses saga (derived, it is usually conceded, from E.) This is all very well. Second Isaiah himself knows and uses the terminology of such tradition. But it is also obvious to him that belief in the highest type of religion does not rest on wonder-working and miracles such as P is continually reporting from the earlier sources, but on the conviction that

> Though Abraham know us not,
> And Israel acknowledge us not,
> Thou, O Lord, art our Father,
> Our redeemer from of old is thy name. (63:16)

---

[1]Which formerly had been the "history" of only a few of the Hebrew tribes-- possibly only of one. Sellin, Ibid, claims that Moses' name was associated with the view

A few shorter references should be cited before leaving the subject of the Exodus, e.g., 46:3:

> Whom I have carried as a load from birth,
> Whom I have borne as a burden from the womb.

Cheyne thinks that the figure of the "father-nurse" found elsewhere is inadequate and that Second Isaiah here gives a more highly colored picture than Is. 63:9, Deut. 1:31, Ex. 19:4 (E), Ps. 28:9, and perhaps also Ps. 68:19, Hos. 11:3. Cf. also Is 42:14, 49:15, 66:9, 13.[1] The Deut. 1:31 passage seems the best source for 46:3. The figure is, as here,

---

of religion of which he was the sworn foe, and that the true tradition, including Moses' martyr death, crops out in Hosea, Second Isaiah and Zechariah. W.F. Albright, contra, thinks we are"no more justified in insisting that the religion introduced by Moses was radically different from that of the book of Exodus, than we would be in trying to divorce the other higher religions (Zoroasterism, Buddhism, Confusianism) from their founders". (Stone Age to Christianity, p. 196.) I think we must wonder, however, at the picture of Moses as a monotheist which he purports to find there: "if. . . . . 'monotheist' means one who teaches the existence of only one God, the creator of everything, the source of justice, who is equally powerful in Egypt, in the desert and in Palestine, who has no sexuality and no mythology, who is human in form, but cannot be seen by human eye and cannot be represented in any form -- then the founder of Yahwism was certainly a monotheist." (Ibid, p. 207.)

If we are to draw parallels from the other major religions, the weight would all be with Sellin's theory that very likely the religion of Israel as developed by the priests was not that of the great religious genius, Moses, who gave Hebrew religion its initial impetus. The relation of the teaching of Jesus to the establishment and organization of the Christian Church is a case exactly in point. Ezekiel's indiscreet picture of the temple at Jerusalem is a far cry from the idealistic monotheism of Moses as Albright sees him.

[1] Prophecies I, p. 302.

human, while the J passage has "How I bore you on eagle's wings and brought you to myself" (cf. Deut. 32:11). A list of parallel references is perhaps more interesting than illuminative:

> You have seen for yourselves what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you on eagle's wings and brought you to myself. (Ex. 19:4 - J) [1]
>
> "I will go along myself", he said, "and lead you." (Ex. 33:14 - J)
>
> But it was I who taught Ephraim to walk;
> I took them up in my arms;
> But they did not know that I cared for them.
> (Hos. 11:3)
>
> In the desert, where the Lord your God carried you, as a man carries his son, all the way of your journey. (Deut. 1:31)
>
> Like an eagle stirring its nestlings,
> Dashing against its brood,
> Spreading its wings to catch them
> And carrying them on its pinions,
> The Lord alone was their leader,
> And no foreign god was with him. (Deut. 32:11)
>
> He said, "Surely they are my people, sons who will not play me false."
> It was no messenger or angel, but his own presence that saved them;
> In his love and pity he redeemed them,
> He took them up and carried them all the days of old. (Is. 63:9)

Either Hosea or the Deuteronomy 1 passage could be the inspiration of the "carrying" idea. There is no reason to doubt that Second Isaiah knew, or could have known, either Hosea or Deut. 1. It has been frequently

---

[1] B.W. Bacon, Triple Tradition of the Exodus, p. 101, makes this a late redaction.

pointed out that Hosea seems to have known certain legends in regard to Moses which were supressed by the Priestly school,[1] but to see the outcropping of such a source here is unnecessary.[2] Rélation to the Song of Deut. 32 are discussed in a separate section.

Is. 48:10:

> Lo, I refined you but not like silver,
> I tested you in the furnace of suffering,

may be a refinement of Deut. 4:20:

> The Lord took you and brought you out of this iron furnace, out of Egypt, to become a people of his very own.

The resemblance to Ezek. 22:18, 22, is even more marked:

> The house of Israel has become dross to me. . . . . dross of silver are they.
>
> As silver is melted in the midst of a furnace, so shall you be melted in the midst of it; and you shall know that I, the Lord, have poured out my fury upon you.

The Second Isaiah passage sounds more like an answer to Ezekiel than reliance upon D. I think it is of little value to our investigation.[3]

---

[1]Sellin, Op. cit. See notes, ante, p. 41, 43.

[2]Scarcely a J source, at any rate. Cf. Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 146, concerning Deut. 34:4.

[3]Millar Burrows, Literary Relations of Ezekiel, fails to mention this passage in establishing dependence of Ezekiel on Is. 40-55.

Is. 49:4b:

> The shame of your youth shall you forget,
> And the reproach of your widowhood shall you
> remember no more,

is generally taken as a reference to enslavement in Egypt and Exile in Babylon, but there can be no assignment to any one source. "Shame" is scarcely a reference to any one tradition. It could refer to Israel's early apostasy in the desert as well as to slavery in Egypt.

Is. 50:3:

> I clothe the heavens in mourning
> And sackcloth I make their covering,

can refer to Ex. 10:21 (E) only if it is a protest that Yahweh and not Moses performed the miracle. If that were the case, we would expect the emphatic form of the pronoun, which is not used. But note Pfeiffer's contention that the original J account of the crossing of the Red Sea was a non-miraculous source.[1]

---

[1] IOT, p. 146. Cf. the emphasis on Yahweh's leadership, Is. 63:9 ff., the very passage in which we find the mention of Moses. Note also that there is no reference to Moses in Deut. 32:1-43, a fact not impressively explained away by the Song having been put into Moses' mouth by the editor. Cf. Ezek. 20, where Egypt seems to be an obsession. There are only three mentions of Moses in the prophetic books: Is.63:11.f., Jer. 15:1, Mal. 4:4. Of these only Is. 63:12 purports to be historic and it is radically questioned as secondary. The prophets seem to have been content with the non-historic statement that Yahweh found Israel in the wilderness.

Is. 52:4:

> To Egypt went down my people at the first to sojourn there,

is our only evidence that Second Isaiah included the Exodus from Egypt in the early history which he accepted for his people. Only here is the name of the land mentioned in this connection, and Duhm and Torrey both repudiate the passage.[1] If they are right, we must notice the close link with Deut. 32:1-43 again, for there, too, we are asked to remember -- not Egypt, but how Yahweh found Israel "in the wilderness". There is, as we have noted, not even a mention of Moses in Is. 40-55, and only once otherwise (in 63:11 ff.)

There is an obvious contrast between Is. 52:12:

> For you shall not go out in haste, nor depart in flight;
> For the Lord shall go before you, and the God of Israel shall be your rearguard,

and the E account of the Exodus in Ex. 12:33, 39:

> The people snatched up their dough before it was levened.
> They had been driven out of Egypt and could not wait,
> Nor had they prepared any provisions for themselves. [2]

---

[1] Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 407; Duhm, quoted Driver, LOT, p. 245. 43:3 and 45:14, mentions of Egypt, have nothing to do with the Exodus. The King James version refers this passage to Gen. 46:6, re Jacob. The motive for insertions by Priestly redactors to make Second Isaiah "conform" to the Pentateuch would be obvious. Such tampering with pre-exilic prophetic books, e.g., Hosea, would of course have been taboo. Only other mentions of Moses in prophecy are Jer. 15:1 (as a person having intercessory favor with God) and Mal. 4:4 (as having received the law at Horeb.) Joshua fares even worse. He is never mentioned in prophecy.

[2] Contrast also:

In the second half of the 52:12 passage, the reference may be to Ex. 13:21 f., 14:20 (J) or to 14:19 (E). J is concerned with a cloud and a column of fire, while in E,

> the angel of god who was accostomed to go in front of the army of Israel, left his position and went behind them.

Deut. 1:29, like J, mentions no vanguard, while 32:12 may be rapudiating the angel idea:

> The Lord alone was their leader
> And no foreign god was with him.

The suggestion of protest in Deut. 32 becomes interesting in view of the close relationship with Second Isaiah which we shall have continuing cause to notice. This element of protest seems evident in both.

I doubt if we are justified in seeing a reference in the passage under discussion to more than Israel's general traditions and the prevalent type of military maneuvers in the age in which it was written.[1] This is even more true of the similar passage, Is. 58:8.

> for in trepedition you left the land of Egypt
> (Deut. 16:3)

with

> For in joy shall you go out
> And in peace shall you be led . . . . . etc.
> (Is. 55:12)

[1] Cf. the Babylonian parallels, A Guillaume, Prophecy and Divination, p. 43. See discussion of Is 52:11, sometimes interpreted in the light of the exodus, under the section on "The Law or the Servant."

Our findings for this section, then, resolve to these:

1. Second Isaiah seems to deal with a popular and extremely familiar tradition in regard to the beginnings of the Hebrew nation rather than to use any one particular "source". Convincing direct verbal correspondences to J, E, and P are lacking, partly, perhaps, because the Pentateuchal sources themselves are so confused. The tradition was apparently so familiar that even vocabulary was common property to the various written sources.

2. There is evidence that Second Isaiah knew and used a tradition common to the pre-exilic prophets (it could scarcely be called a source) which took no account of Egypt and placed the beginnings of Israel's history where Yahweh found her in the wilderness.[1] He knew Deuteronomy passages based on E and probably E itself. There is no evidence here of familiarity with J not as well satisfied by presuming a knowledge of E.

3. Second Isaiah seems out of sympathy with P's emphasis on the wonder-workings in Egypt and with making them part of the "official" Hebrew tradition by incorporation in the Pentateuch.

4. There is much evidence of close relationship

---

[1] A different theological insight? God seeks out Israel.

to Deut. 32:1-43. Each says Yahweh found Israel in the wilderness instead of emphasizing the "Exodus" proper, for instance. The relationship seems scarcely one of "source" however, and we must wait for evidence of the exact nature of the relationship, which will be treated in a later section.

C. An Ancient Source

It is not the province of this thesis to pass upon the nature or content of the fourth source in Genesis or Exodus, or whether the questioned passages are best described by Bacon's J2, Eissfeldt's L or Pfeiffer's S.[1]

We have had some evidence in the section on the Creation that Pfeiffer's post-P date for the insertion of the Gen. 2-11 non-Priestly stories in the Pentateuch[2] might account for certain problems as to Second Isaiah's sources. This does not, of course, necessarily imply agreement as to Pfeiffer's treatment of the semi-historical narratives which he assigns to this source and the Edomite locale to which he credits them.

---

[1] S. Mowinckel, Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11, p. 7 ff., reviews the scholarly opinions and linguistic arguments which compel the recognition of two pre-D strands in this section. His identification of them as J and E seems to me dubious, however. Morgenstern's K, which begins with Moses, plus Pfeiffer's S source, comes close to Eisfeldt's L. See also G. von Rad, Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch re the non-priestly source which he recognizes here (quoted Record and Revelation, p. 78.)

[2] IOT, p. 159 ff. Pfeiffer identifies the Cain-Noah literature as S2. He thinks the Noah story re-written from the Gilgamesh epic where Noah was Ut-naphistim. (Cheyne,"Noah", Encyclopaedia Biblica, col. 3245, quotes Hommel as identifying Sit-Napisti of the Gilgamesh epic with Nahnapisti, hence with Noah.) Pfeiffer dates the insertion of this material in the S strand as 600-400 B.C.

Nor need we accept without further consideration Pfeiffer's arguments for a late (S2) date for the insertion of the Flood story in the

---

P, he says, knew S2 but not S, each of which had its own, and different, Noah. The Noah of the vinyard and the Noah of the Flood can scarcely be the same. Pfeiffer finds that S had no Flood story but that the

> "S2 story of the Flood has suffered severe disarrangement and loss through insertion into the P story; S2 represents, however, the earliest Hebrew transcript of the Babylonian Flood story in the Gilgemesh epic." (IOT, p. 161.)

The name נֹחַ , meaning "rest" is explained in Gen. 5:29 by a play on the word יְנַחֲמֵנוּ , comfort (cf. Is. 40:1, etc.) Lemech says: "This is the one, after the work and labor of our hands, to bring us consolation from the very soil that the Lord cursed" (S). Skinner says that this promise of comfort refers to the wine from the vine which Noah, as the proverbial Palestinian husbandman, was to cultivate. This is obviously the one possible explanation if the Flood story is a late insertion, as Pfeiffer says. See Skinner, Genesis ICC, p. 134.

Cf. Ps. 104:15:

> And wine may cheer man's heart,
> Making his face brighter than oil.

We have already had occassion to notice this Psalm in our discussion of the Creation. An incredibly wide range of datings have been suggested for it, and a special study of it in relation to Second Isaiah and the Flood material (or the S source) would be interesting and probably rewarding. We cannot, however, go more fully into the questions regarding this relationship at the present time. Whether the vine or the rainbow was the original symbol of man's consolation, it would have been difficult for a writer to find a more perfect archetype for restoration and a new start than the ancient figure of Noah as Second Isaiah knew him: the hero of the Flood. Who so stood for a new beginning on the land? Who so well represented the concept of universality which was pervading the Hebrew religion, as this "Second Father" whom rabbinical Judaism made the special patron of the proselyte? (See note, sq., p. 65.)

S material.[1]

Our tentative suggestion, for which we shall presently attempt to present evidence, is simply that Second Isaiah knew and referred to this material or its source, including the Flood story. If the evidence seems to justify this conclusion, we shall then want to ask whether he knew it:

1. As it occurs in the Pentateuch, substantially in its present form.

2. As used by P. We become involved here, of course, in the whole question of the S2 source suggested by Pfeiffer, as well as his post-P date for insertion of S in the Pentateuch. To pass judgment on this and upon the score of critical questions involved would be presumptuous . But to point out some of the ramifications of the problem, and their relationship to Second Isaiah,will be worth while.

3. As a source. And was this the same source known to P, to S, or to both? If more than one source was involved, did Second Isaiah show preferences as between them? And can a study of Second Isaiah add anything to the possibility of identifying such sources?

---

[1] IOT, p. 161.

We have already discussed the treatment of the Creation in Second Isaiah, although our approach probably did less than justice to the relationship to Gen. 2:4 ff. However, we chose to confine ourselves for the moment to what may prove a very enlightening as well as difficult relationship: that of Second Isaiah to the Noah stories. The analogy of restoration on the land and the idea of the universal bond of the common father would both have been very acceptable to Second Isaiah. The reference in 54:9 is distinctly to the Noah of the Flood, which Pfeiffer believes to be a Priestly insertion in Genesis from the Babylonian:[1]

> "For like the days of Noah is this to me;
> As I swore that the waters of Noah
> Should no more pass over the earth,
> So have I sworn no more to be angry with you,
> Nor to rebuke you.
> Though the mountains should be removed,
> And the hills should waver,
> My kindness shall not depart from you,
> And my covenant of peace shall not waver,"
> Says the Lord who has pity upon you.

---

[1] IOT, p. 205. But A.T. Clay, A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform, ascribes a Hebrew origin to the Flood story. It would be more surprising than otherwise if versions of it were not current in Palestine. But Pfeiffer says:

> "The story of the Flood in P (parts of Gen. 6-9) is another example of the direct or indirect acquaintance which the Priestly authors had with the Babylonian writings. The technical details of dates and measurements, the close connection with P's four revelations, and the dry, schematic style contrast sharply with the S2 incomplete story of the Flood with which it is

This is the only Old Testament reference to Noah outside the Genesis stories, except Ezek. 14:14, 20, where the ancient heroes Noah, Daniel and Job are mentioned as symbols of righteousness, and the composite genealogy by which the Chronicler (I Chron. 1:4, cf. Luke 3:36) attempted to reconcile conflicting records.

Torrey says:

> "The mention of the flood in the days of Noah and especially the reminder of the solemn covenant which God gave to mankind at this time, is the most interesting of the numerous allusions in II Isaiah to the scriptures contained in the Pentateuch."

He finds the reference "obviously to Gen. 9:8-17 (P)", not paralleled elsewhere.[1] Cheyne, however, thinks it may refer to either 9:11 or 8:21,[2] while Kayser expresses the belief that it might refer to "a lost portion of the Jehovistic record".[3]

---

now combined. As in Gen. 1, the authors of P make their source conform with their norms and principles and use an old story to explain the origin of legal prescriptions (Gen. 2:2 f.; 9:1-6.)

"A divine covenant is ushered into the Flood story wholly unwarranted by the sources (6:18; 9:9-17) and also a reference to man's creation according to the image of God (9:6; cf. 1:27). Apropos of the oracle in 1:28-30, which prescribed vegetarianism, the authors of the Flood story extended permission to eat meat (9:1-3), without, however, distinguishing between pure and impure animals (as in S2, 8:20) since the dietary laws were first revealed to Moses. Similarly, P omits Noah's sacrifice, the climax of both the Babylonian and S2 (8:20-22) stories, because no legitimate sacrifices could be offered before the ritual laws were revealed to Moses."

[1] Second Isaiah, p. 424.

[2] Prophecies II, p. 56.

[3] Das vorexilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels, p.168

The question seems to hinge on the actual mention of a covenental oath. Cheyne, following Delitzsch, is probably right that the thought is sufficiently implied in the non-Priestly source. He cites Sam. 7:12-16, where no oath is mentioned, yet no one doubts the reference is to v. 35.[1] I do not feel that the evidence within the passage itself is sufficient to assign a source definitely. A common source would seem the only conclusion open to Pfeiffer, whose date for Second Isaiah is earlier than either P or the inclusion of S in the Pentateuch.[2]

Second Isaiah (54:9, 57:16) treats the Noah material much as Pfeiffer finds it treated in the late insertion in P (see p.51,ante.) There is the flood and the covenant and the mention of God's spirit in the living being that he has made (57:16). Most important, perhaps, the covenant of peace (54:10, cf. 57:16, 59:21) is here presumed as the logical climax of the Flood (cf. Gen. 9:9-11- P).

---

[1] Prophecies II, p. 56.

[2] S.A. Cook, The Old Testament, a Reinterpretation, p. 87 f., tells of a Babylonian tablet that seems to indicate a knowledge of Noah of both the vine and the ark: there is a list of animals, by twos or sevens, on one side; on the other is a list of wines. Cook points out that in the Old Testament are allusions which "reflect a knowledge of other versions(of creation and deluge) besides the 'canonical' account in Genesis", referring as examples to the giant story of Gen 6, the Rahab account of Job 26:12, and the Paradise reference in Ezek. 28:12 ff.

Of course we should not expect to find Second Isaiah making sacrifice the climax of the story, but it would seem strange if both he and the Priestly redactor independently chose the same "foreign" story, and then discarded its very climax, but for different reasons, Second Isaiah because he had no faith in the efficacy of sacrifice, P because he was saving the promulgation of its regulations for Moses.

The allusions in Second Isaiah are far too indefinite to be the "source" of the more precise and expansive P. The alternative, unless we accept a common source, which is altogether possible in view of the many versions of the Flood story which seem to have been current at this time[1] is that Second Isaiah knew the P Noah stories approximately as they now stand in the

---

[1] Skinner, Genesis ICC, p. 174, quotes Andree's listing (in 1891) of 80 to 90 various flood stories of which 26 were related to the Babylonian. Recent studies would undoubtedly greatly increase these figures. J.G. Frazer, Folklore in the Old Testament, p. 54, dates two early versions of the Sumerian Flood story 1966 B.C. and 2100 B.C. A.T. Clay, A Hebrew Deluge Story, p. 32, suggests that the western (Amorite) deluge story may be dated as early as 4000 B.C., and that it influenced the Babylonian, rather than vice versa. The problem of origins for this, as for other such widely circulated stories of ancient days, will probably continue to baffle us. But for purposes of religion and religious interpretations (if not for pure "scholarship") the important thing is that we understand and appreciate the type of problem with which we are dealing, rather than that we make any pretense of having found the "answer".

Pentateuch.[1] For light on this subject we shall have to consider verbal comparisons. We may note here, however, that Noah's righteousness was already proverbial at the time of Ezekiel, and that it was more likely the affair of the ark than of the vine that won him such a reputation. The casualness of Ezekiel's allusion indicates that the character, in this role, was well known. Pfeiffer has presented the evidence that P knew this (S2) material. There is no reason why Second Isaiah should not have known the same sources. But S2 contains the customary sacrifice climax (Gen. 8:20). So we are forced again to the conclusion that if this was P's source, then Second Isaiah was probably, in this passage, dependent on P. The S2 phase of Pfeiffer's theory has not seemed especially convincing to me, however, and I would not eliminate on that ground alone the complete possibility of a common source which did not end in sacrifice.

By way of a more general speculation as to possible sources, we note that the interests of the S source as identified by Pfeiffer at once suggest similar interests in

---

[1]Cf. Albright's early dating for P. He says: "It is likely that the entire Pentateuch was compiled in substantially its present form before 522 B.C." Stone Age to Christianity, p. 265.

the Enoch literature: e.g., the Garden of Eden (Enoch 32:6, 60:8, 23, 61:12, 70:3, 77:3), the Giants (Gen. 6, En. 7,15), the Flood (Jub. 5, En. 10:2 f., 89).[1] Now the Noah literature back of Enoch and Jubilees was undoubtedly of considerable antiquity. So far as I know, no one has ventured a date for it beyond saying it must have been in existence when it was mentioned in the Bock of Jubilees (10, 21) or quoted by the authors of Enoch (6:3-8, 8:1-3, 9:7, 10:1-3 and 11, c. 17-20, 39:1-2a, 41:3-8, c. 43-44, 54:7-55:2, c 59-60, 65-69:25, c. 106-7.)[2] What relationship may there have been between this ancient literature and a source known and favored by Second Isaiah? Selections from it could have been incorporated in the Pentateuch as a post-P addition, perhaps as a concession to the non-Priestly school, and the original source later would have become the inspiration of the inter-testamental apocalyptists. It seems hardly reasonable that the rather wierd interest in the heavens and their host, for instance, which develops in the later writings (e.g., En. 9-33, 39:12 ff., 41, 75) is dependent on Second Isaiah. But influence of a common source would be understandable.[3]

---

[1] See Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 160 for detail analysis of his S source.

[2] R.H. Charles, Enoch, p. 33.

[3] A listing of possible relationships is beyond the scope of this paper.

Jeremiah had been interested in "peace" as an abstract concept; still, we cannot but compare Enoch's oft-reiterated judgment on the wicked, "they shall find no peace" (1:8, 5:4, 12:5, 13:1, 16:4, 94:6, 97:11 and 15, 99:13, 101:3, 102:3, 103:8) with Second Isaiah's:"There shall be no peace", says the Lord (says my God) "for the wicked" (48:2, 57:21).

Noah's name appears in Second Isaiah (54:9) but not otherwise in the Old Testament except in the Genesis stories of suspected late insertion, as a symbol of righteousness in Ezek. 14:14, and in a genealogical notice of the Chronicler (I Chron. 1:4). He is important in apocryphal literature.

The "foundations" of the earth, the interest in the vine and in animals, and the mention of the garden of the Lord which was to become so popular in later literature, are all found in this suspected source, then again in Second Isaiah, Ezekiel, Job and certain Psalmists, and finally in the Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha.

Is it not possible that we find these stories in the more original form in the later writings, and that Second Isaiah modified and universalized them in very much the same way we have seen he did the E material and the Babylonian creation myths -- as he used all

materials to prove the oneness and omnipotence of God? It is probably pushing the argument too far to note that Enoch 89 makes no mention of sacrifice in connection with Noah. After all, the author is not giving details.

Pfeiffer calls attention to a pessimism in regard to cultural progress which pervades the S source.[1] The Enoch literature echoes that pessimism in the stories of Azazel and Semjaza (Enoch 6 ff., 54 f.) Is. 47:10 makes the abstract philosophical pronouncement: Your wisdom and your skill have led you astray.

The fact that Ezekiel, Job and certain Psalmists share concepts with Second Isaiah by no means vitiates this contention of relationship, nor is it necessary to decide questions of priority between them at the moment. A common source seems more reasonable for Second Isaiah and Ezekiel than interdependence: it is hard to imagine them quoting each other. As for Job, an apparent lack of appreciation of the book's religion on the part of Pfeiffer does not gain credence for his early dating: most scholars will probably still concede it as post-exilic.[2] Dates for the Psalms are too uncertain and

---

[1] IOT, p. 163.

[2] Albright, however, says probably 5th or 6th century. Stone Age to Christianity, p. 252.

disputed to be significant. Because our present discussion must be limited, and since it does not radically affect our argument concerning priority as between the Pentateuch and the writings of Second Isaiah even if some other work was an intermediary link, I shall assume the priority of Second Isaiah in relation to Ezekiel, Job and Psalms unless specific passages indicate otherwise. And if they are later, they may, for the time being, be eliminated from our problem.

It is interesting to note that while most of the references to the Exodus in Second Isaiah which go uncontested (the Trito-Isaiah controversy aside) are in the first half, those which tie it to the Noah literature are in the latter half of the book. But to cite chapter 54 as evidence that even the first half is post-exilic[1] does not take into account the possibility that Chapter 55 is a good finale for the exodus discussion, while in 54 and again in 56 ff. are the most frequent references to concepts which the apocalyptic literature has taught us to think of in connection with a Noah source.[2] Some

---

[1] Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 423.

[2] An example of the common enough literary device of dovetailing two works, such as Torrey recognizes between the first and Second Isaiah, including c. 34-35 with 40 ff. Notice the parallel thought, as initial verses, in 40:1 and 54:1. This does not imply that there are no

of these we shall cite presently. It would seem too much of a coincidence for Enoch, frankly dependent on the Book of Noah, to chose a number of concepts, previously unrelated to Noah, from these very chapters where Second Isaiah choses to talk about Noah.

We have already mentioned the judgment on the wicked: "they shall find no peace" (cf. Is. 57:21, paralleled 48:2.) We have spoken, too, of the fact that Noah, in rabbinical writings, became the special patron of proselytes (cf. Is.56).[1]

The emphasis on the land (57:13, 60:21, 65:16) is a Noachian concept in line with Gen. 8:21 f.

The passage 57:16:

> For I will not contend forever,
> Nor be angry for all time;
> For from me preceeds the spirit,
> And the living being that I have made,

recalls Gen. 6:3: My spirit must not remain in man forever, inasmuch as he is flesh. And this latter is part of the Giant story, either badly clipped in Gen. 6 or wildly expanded in Enoch -- quite probably both.

---

references to the Noah literature in the first part of the work: some will be mentioned. And of course we have cited exodus passages from the latter chapters.

[1]The alien's rights under later Jewish law were based on his relationship to Noah as the common father. Though he was not even permitted to "keep the law", he could obey the "seven Noachian precepts" (valid for all mankind before Moses) and thus advance to a position of proselyte. The seven precepts were: (1) obedience to

Whatever this Gen. 2-11 source, that has been so much discussed, Second Isaiah seems to have known either it or its source.[1]

In chapter 59 we see the nation Israel as the righteous and redeemed one: a role of which Noah might well be the archetype. Man's wickedness and God's displeasure are dwelt upon at length. Now, "that men may revere the name of the Lord", he shall "come like a pent-up stream".

> But to Zion he shall come as redeemer,
> And shall remove transgression from Jacob. . . . .
> "As for me, this is my covenant with you," says the Lord:
> "My spirit which is upon you, and my words which I have put in your mouth, shall not depart from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your offspring . . . . .
> from henceforth, even forever." (59:20-21)

This has been held to refer to Gen. 9:9 or 17:4 (both P). The same arguments would apply as to 54:9, but the argument here is somewhat stronger for either P or a lost source.

The idea of Israel as the servant is paralleled here with the idea of Israel as the redeemed one, but with much less ambiguity as to prototype than in c. 52-53. Israel as the redeemed one is, indeed, the theme above all others of Second Isaiah. During the period when Israel was in exile, redemption would be best symbolized for the people by the story of the trek into Palestine, God's care for his

---

authority (2) reverence for the divine name (3) abstinence from idolotry (4) from incest (5) from murder (6) from robbery and (7) from eating animals with the blood. (D.M. Kay, "Noachian Precepts", HERE IX, p. 380.)

[1]See discussion of 57:16 and Gen. 2:7, sq.

people on the journey and the removal of those obstacles which stood in the way of fulfillment of his purpose for them. After the return, however, the appropriate symbol was the second chance granted to mankind after the flood, the restoration on the land, the return to normal life and a degree of security for the future: seed time and harvest, and the assurance that though the days had passed when Israel could hope to stand out in rigid isolation against the forces of internationalism, she remained, religiously, God's redeemed one, through whom, eschatologically, all nations of the world were to be blest. I suggest that the similarity of treatment of the two themes suggests the same author for Is. 40-66 (with, probably, a number of interpolations) but that 40-53,55 was written in Babylon, under conditions we shall hereafter try to reconstruct, while 54, 56-66 is to bolster the spirits of the returned exiles and their fellows who had remained all the while in Jerusalem.

The dropping of the controversial tone in the later chapters has frequently been remarked.[1] This is hardly accounted for simply by Second Isaiah's preference for the Noah source, which he is now using. On the other hand, if P had his way with the compiling of the Pentateuch (as we believe he did) and that body of

---

[1]E.g., Driver, LOT, p. 234.

literature was rapidly becoming "official"(with the priesthood at least), for the Jewish religion, the time for protest would be passed. There was still room for interpretation: see chapter 58.[1]

We cannot here go into a fuller investigation of the relationship of Second Isaiah, the Noah literature, the non-Priestly source in Gen. 2-11, and P's Noah story. All this would be a long study in itself, and probably a very rewarding one.[2]

---

[1] See the discussion of 63:11, ante..

[2] As an example of the ramifications of such a study, consider the question of the calendar, which Ed. König ("Kalandarfragen in altheebraischen Schrifttum", ZDMG LX,1906, p. 605-644) and Julian Morgenstern ("Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel", HUCA X, 1935) agree was acute at this time and decidedly a subject of religious interest. P apparently advocated a change to a new luni-solar system. This involved the question of the passover and its etiological explanation in the flight from Egypt, a story which Second Isaiah did not adopt. Was he protesting calendar reform, or the perversion of Israel's history for that purpose? Enoch was intensely interested in this matter, and Enoch of the 365 years (Gen. 5:23 - P) is generally considered a patron of the solar calendar, which had been the earliest of the Hebrew systems, probably borrowed from the Canaanite. Morgenstern thinks the calendar advocated by the authors of Enoch and Jubilees, but never put into effect, was in opposition to that of P and I and II Maccabees. This seems to accord rather well with our speculations. To argue that Second Isaiah was not one to interest himself in such matters is to fail to appreciate the religious significance to a people of a pre-scientific era.

For another ramification of such an investigation, see the article by G. A. Cooke, "Paradise Story in Ezekiel XXVIII", in O.T. Essays, p. 39 f., pointing out similarities in Gen. 2-3, Isaiah 14, Job and Enoch. He says: "Several

A few verbal investigations are called for. Most interesting is the use of "all flesh", which, while not a term exclusive with Second Isaiah and the Pentateuch,[1] might be classed as "characteristic" of their relationship. It occurs:

Is. 40:5 All flesh shall see the glory of Yahweh.

40:6 All flesh is grass.

49:26 All flesh shall know that I am thy savior (cf. Ezek. 21:5).

66:16 The Lord shall hold judgment on all flesh.

66:23 All flesh shall come and worship before me.

66:24 They shall be an abhorence to all flesh.[2]

---

versions of the Paradise myth must have been current in Palestine from the earliest times; two we can distinguish in J's narrative; Gunkel (Schöpf. u. Ch., 148) finds the reminiscence of another in Job 15:7 f., and elsewhere. These amcient myths were not of native Hebrew origin, but belonged to the common stock of Semitic tales. Some forms of them have been preserved in the Babylonian epics, some in Phoenecian. In Genesis, they have been purged by the genius of Hebrew religion; in Ezekiel the purifying process has not gone so far." He might have added that Second Isaiah delftly extracts the kernel of religious wisdom which each has to contribute.

[1]See also Jer. 25:31, 32:27, 45:5, Ezek. 20:48, 21:4, Joel 2:28, Zech. 2:13.

[2]Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 438, would add 58:7, where, he says, "hide not yourself from your own flesh" refers to "all mankind". But cf. Gen. 29:14, 37:27, etc.

Gen. 6:12 All flesh has corrupted his way.

6:13 The end of all flesh has come before me.

7:21 All flesh died that moved upon the earth.

8:17 Bring forth all flesh, both fowl and cattle.

9:11, 15 Nor shall all flesh be cut off any more.

9:16 Covenant between me and all flesh.

Lev. 17:14 (H) Life of all flesh is the blood.

Nu. 16:22 (P) The God of the spirits of all flesh.

18:15 (P) Everything that openeth the matrix of all flesh.

Deut. 5:26 (D) Who of all flesh heard the word of God.

Strangely, all of the Genesis passages are from the P version of the Noah story. In Exodus, P does not use the expression at all, and both occurences of it in Numbers are in confused, composite passages.[1] But in speaking of the Flood, P uses the term כל בשר which we find in Second Isaiah. The corresponding expression which we find in the non-Priestly source (Gen. 7:4, 23) is כל הקום. The two implications of כל בשר, as used in each of the Second Isaiah passages is (1) universality and (2) transitory nature, as compared, e.g., with the "thou shalt know" at the end of the oracle (49:23) or with

---

[1] Driver, LOT, p. 64.

the abiding quality of Yahweh's word (40:8) or Yahweh himself as savior of Israel (49:26). Skinner objects, rightly, to restricting "all flesh" as used in the P passages, to mankind. In 6:19, 7:15-16 and 8:17, it seems to refer distinctly to animals only, but the reverse, i.e., man rather than animals, "could only be allowed on clear evidence."[1] Yet one is not conscious of Second Isaiah even including animals.[2] This all suggests that what seemed at first as an important connection with P, may be rather acquaintance with P's source for this passage. P here adopts the term from his source, but does not make it his own to the extent of using it elsewhere. The closest relationship here seems to be between Second Isaiah and Deut. 5:26: Who of all flesh (what mortal) has heard the voice of the living God speak out of the fire as we have? Our evidence scarcely warrents conclusions as to priority as between the two.[3] Lev. 17:14, from the

---

[1] Genesis ICC, p. 159.

[2] See Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 438 re 58:7.

[3] Driver, LOT, p. 145, from a completely different angle, concludes that some of the Priestly Code, such as the distinction between clean and unclean, the prohibition against blood, avenging bleed, etc., were ancient in Israel, and that D is to some extent dependent upon these earlier Toroth.

holiness code, is very literal in its use of the term: the life of every creature (all flesh) is identified with the blood. The passage deals with the prohibition of the eating of blood (a regulation closely identified with Noah.)

Two other verbal references to the non-Priestly Gen. 2-11 source seem worth noting:

Concerning Is. 57:16, Cheyne says: "the choice of the word for 'soul' (neshamah , lit. breath) is itself significant; it means the principle of life breathed immediately by God into the human body (Gen. 2:7), the self-conscious personal spirit."[1] But the word נשמה is common.

Is. 65:25, stating that the serpent's food shall be dust, seems like a direct quote from Gen. 3:14. Torrey sees in the allusion evidence of the author's "sly humor". As the writer "thinks on Is. 11:8 and of the improvised diet of once dangerous beasts, Gen. 3:14 comes to mind, and he adds the reflection, 'No change for the old serpent.'"[2] But Duhm, partly on metrical grounds, rejects these words as a gloss.[3]

---

[1] Prophecies II, p. 75.

[2] Second Isaiah, p. 470.

[3] Quoted, Skinner, Isaiah , p. 220.

Our conclusions, then, are these:

1. The wide distribution of the Paradise and Flood stories in the ancient world, and the many differing yet closely related versions occurring in Palestine as well as Sumeria from earliest times, makes certainty as to sources almost impossible.

2. Second Isaiah knew and was apt to refer to certain tradition of Gen. 2-11, including the Noah flood story.

3. His references to the non-Priestly source may be either direct or to a common source. Certain similarities between Gen. 2-11, Is. 54, 56-66, and the later apocalypses of Jubilees and Enoch, suggest a common source (the Noah literature?) in back of them all.

4. Second Isaiah's references to the Flood do not involve the usual climax of sacrifice which is almost universal to the various versions. This suggests direct dependence on P, or possibly on a special source used by P. Study of the term "all flesh" favors the special source.

5. These references, and the emphasis on Noah as the symbol of restoration on the land, occur in the second half of the book (54, 56-66). This may be evidence that the first half was written in Babylon, and interested itself primarily with the Exodus theme as symbolic of the

expected return, while the second part was written in Palestine and made the Noah story symbolic of a new start and restoration on the land.

6. This would mean difference of theme and source as well as of time and locale, and thus account for certain differences in vocabulary, for instance, which may have been taken as evidences of diverse authorship.

7. Dropping of the controversial tone in the last half of the book suggests that the composition and even official priestly acceptance of the Pentateuch had progressed to the point where interpretation rather than criticism would be most effective.

D. A Late Song: Deut. 32:1-43

There is no passage in the Pentateuch with such apparent relationships to Second Isaiah as the so-called "Song of Moses", in Deut. 32. The Song is obviously neither an integral part of Deuteronomy nor Mosaic, but there is little agreement as to date and scarcely even speculation among scholars as to authorship. The fact that there are two distinct introductions to the Song proper,[1] and certain similarities to the "Blessing" in Duet. 33, further complicates the question of dating. The introductions suggest to Driver late insertion by one of the Deuteronomic school, but Pfeiffer thinks "the poem was inserted by the Priestly redactor late in the fifth century" and that the Song itself is a didactic psalm composed in the first half of the fifth century.[2]

Strangely, C. H. Cornill, who so underestimates Second Isaiah, has referred to this poem as a "compendium of prophetic theology," a judgment which Pfeiffer, who does appreciate Second Isaiah, finds unwarranted.[3]

Certainly no discussion of the relationship of Second Isaiah to the Pentateuch should fail to give special mention to this writing. We shall consider,

---

[1] 31:16-22 and 31:24-30 (Driver, LOT, p. 95 f.) or 31:16-21, 30, and 31:24-27 (Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 280.)

[2] Ibid.

[3] IOT, p. 280.

therefore, some of the passages which seem particularly associated with it, in the order of their occurence in Second Isaiah. Let us look first at 41:4b:

> I, the Lord, who am the first
> And am also with the last. . . . .

Cheyne translates

> I, Yahweh, am the first
> And with the last I am He,[1]

making a parallel to Deut. 32:39:

> Know now that I, I am He
> And there is no god beside me.

Skinner also sees an allusion to the E passage, Ex. 3:14, concerning the explanation of Yahweh's name to Moses. This may readily be. If Deut. 32 is earlier than Second Isaiah, it is the most direct source. Both writings display a yearning to find a vocabulary to express the uniqueness of Yahweh; possibly Second Isaiah presses the thought further, makes it somewhat more colorful, and might therefore be thought of as later.

If we assume identity or close kinship of authorship of Second Isaiah and Deut. 32, then familiarity with E would be indicated.

---

[1] Prophecies I, p. 254 f. Cf. 43:10, 13; 46:4; 48:12, etc., Deut. 32:39, Ps. 102:28. The LXX has a different rendering for the psalm passage, using σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς εἶ instead of ἐγὼ εἰμὶ as in all the Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah passages. To this list Skinner adds Is. 43:25, 52:6 (Isaiah, p. 17). Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 407, characterizes this as "one of the prophet's favorite phrases." See especially c. 43-45.

With Is. 43:12:

I foretold, I saved, I announced --I, and no alien god among you;
And you are my witnesses,

compare Deut. 32:12: The Lord alone was their leader, and no foreign god was with him; or 32:16: They provoked him to jealousy with alien gods.

The uniqueness of the god of Israel in relation to the gods of other nations is a central theme of all of Is. 43-45.[1] Foreign gods, rather than the baals or even idols have become Yahweh's great rivals.[2] There is an interesting element of anachronism observable in both passages: "foreign gods" did not worry Israel's early historians. Rival gods are mentioned by Jeremiah (2:25, 3:12, 5:19) and in Psalms (44:21 and 81:9).[3]

Torrey takes the Isaiah passage as referring to the promise to Abraham, the deliverance from Egypt and

---

[1]In this and the following discussions I have presumed the literary unity of Isaiah 43-45, which seems demonstrable beyond doubt. 44:9-20, which breaks into the unity of the poem, and the much disputed Cyrus passage, yield no Deuteronomy parallels, so we need not consider them here.

[2]In Deut. 32:8 they are rationalized by making Yahweh "assign" the foreign nations to these lesser guardians, while keeping the Hebrew people especially for himself. The passage is to be understood as late poetry, rather than as an example of early theology.

[3]Both Psalms are probably late, though Buttenwieser makes 81b the earliest of the Psalter.(Psalms, p.56.)

subsequent prophecy,[1] which would make it very close to Deut. 32:12. It is quite impossible to assign priority, or to say whether the source for both or either was Jeremiah. After all, when alien gods become a problem, what more natural than to discuss them in religious circles.

Concerning the uniqueness of Yahweh, compare Is. 43:3, 11; 44:6,8; 45:5, 18, 22, with Deut. 4:35; 32:4, 39.

There are few more significant bonds between the Pentateuch and Second Isaiah than the use of the name Jeshurun for Israel. It occurs only Is. 44:2 and Deut. 32:15, 33:5, 26.

The term is interesting and invites discussion. Connection with the appelation "upright one" in Nu. 23:10 (JE) as applied to Israel has been suggested but seems far-fetched. Cheyne sees in the three names Jacob, Israel and Jeshurun, three stages of the nation's moral progress.[2] But certainly the last name never became popular. The one point of interest here is its unique use in these two passages of suspected close relationship and in the Blessing of Deut. 33. Driver thinks Deut. 33 was incorporated in the Pentateuch at the same time as the

---

[1] SI, p. 338.

[2] Prophecies I, p. 282.

rest of Deuteronomy, though handed down separately.[1] But Pfeiffer says: "The psalm enclosing the Blessing of Moses (Deut. 33:2-5, 26-29) resembles the poems of Deut. 32 and Ex. 15 in a general way and like them belongs to the fifth century, probably the second half."[2] If Driver is correct, the Second Isaiah and Deut. 32 use of the term Jeshurun may be dependent on the Blessing, before the latter's incorporation in the Pentateuch. At any rate, the use of the term generally strengthens the arguments for close relationship between Second Isaiah and Deut. 32.

Another term of interest is the use of Rock as a name for God. Second Isaiah uses this, 44:8:

> Is there a God beside me,
> Or a Rock of whom I know not?

Occurences of the idea of God as a Rock in the early Old Testament books are most interesting. See Gen. 49:24f.(The Blessing of Jacob),[3] I Sam. 2:2 (The Song of

---

[1] LOT, p. 95.

[2] IOT, p. 281.

[3]
> But their bow was broken by the Eternal
> And their arms and hands trembled,
> At the might of the Mighty One of Jacob,
> At the name of the Shepherd, the Rock of Israel,
> At your fathers' God who helps you
> And God Almighty who blesses you
> With the blessings of the heavens above
> And the blessings of the abyss crouching below.

Hannah)[1], II Sam. 22:2 (The Song of David)[2] and Deut. 32 (The Song of Moses) where it occurs v. 4, 15, 18,

---

Driver, LOT, p. 19, says this is incorporated by J from an independent source. "The historical and geographic conditions reflected in it are those of the period of Judges, Samuel and David and this is the age in which the ancient tradition of the patriarch's blessing must have been cast into its present poetical form." B. W. Bacon, Genesis of Genesis, p. 220, remarks without explaining, the numerous word-plays "which are a striking characteristic of this and similar poems (cf. e.g. the Blessing of Moses, Deut. 33)". He compares especially Gen. 49:13; Deut. 33:19, Gen. 49:26, Deut. 33:15 f. He follows G. F. Moore in seeing a reference to the tehom of Gen. 1, in 49:25. This would suggest a late date. At least part of the basis for the early date is v. 26, where the attitude is that of "a Judean to whom the preeminence of Ephriam has become an accepted fact -- even a matter of patriotic gratulation". (Bacon, Op. cit., p. 220.) Without actually questioning this early date, is it not possible to conceive that a later writer with a sense of history could have put these words into Jacob's mouth, as evidence that the Lord foretold from the beginning -- and suddenly it happened? (see Is. 48:3.) Particularly might this be true of such a writer if he wished his countrymen to no longer harbor an animosity which had permeated the intervening years, but to include their northern neighbors in future plans? (see Is. 48:1, and discussion sq., on the Law or the Servant.)

[1]

> There is none holy as the Lord; for there is none beside thee: neither is there any Rock like our God.

King James version. The Chicago translation does not use the word Rock. Driver puts this song later than Solomon, but does not commit himself to a definite date. (LOT, p. 74.)

[2]

> The Lord is my rock, my fortress and my deliverer; My God, my rock in whom I take refuge.

See also 22:3, 32,47; 23:3. C. 21-24 is a "late appendix of miscellaneous materials." (Driver, LOT, p. 183.) Cf. Ps. 18. It has been suggested that II Sam. 22:2-51 and 23:1-7 are both post-exilic. 22:17 may be a reference to Tiamat.

30, 31, 37.[1]

The appelation is a common one in Psalms.[2] It also occurs several times in Isaiah 1-39: 17:10, 26:4, 32:2. But all of these passages have been questioned as late.[3]

---

[1]
He is a rock; what he does is right.

So they forsook the God who made them
And scoffed at the rock of their salvation.

You neglected the very Rock who bore you
And forgot the God who gave you birth.

How could one person chase a thousand,
Or two put ten thousand to flight,
Unless their Rock had sold them,
And the Lord had given them up?

For their rock is not like our Rock,
Nor is our God a thing of nought.

And that it is being said, "Where is their God,
The Rock in whom they sought refuge?"

[2]
19:14, 28:1, 31:2,3, 42:9, 61:2, 62:6,7, 71:3, 73:26, 78:35, 89:26, 94:22, 95:1.

[3]Late usage or dependence on Second Isaiah or the Songs quoted would be sufficient explanation for the occurances in Psalms. But it must be admitted that the frequent use, but all in late passages, in Is. 1-39 is extremely puzzling. Why always in Isaiah, but not in late additions to other prophets? Did someone with whom this was a frequent term edit Isaiah 1-39? Could this account for other confusing similarities between first and Second Isaiah?

It is difficult to know what to say of this material, for there is not a single passage in the lot whose date has not been the subject of critical question by competent scholars.. It certainly seems odd that this use of the word Rock occurs in pre-exilic literature only in the "Songs" which are obvious insertions in the early books, and with far the most frequency in Deut. 32, which has so many other close affinities with Second Isaiah.. We shall have to deal later with the Blessing of Jacob, from Genesis 49.[1] Within the short passage here quoted are combined such favorite Second Isaiah concepts as the Shepherd (Is. 40:11, 44:28, 63:11 -- a figure which seems borrowed from Jeremiah, cf. especially Is. 40:11, Jer. 31:10), the Mighty One of Jacob (Is. 49:26, 60:16), Rock of Israel (Is. 44:8, 51:1), and, if we accept Moore's interpretation, the Tiamat myth.

Could it be possible that these various Songs were the work of an individual or group from the time of the exile, saturated with the study of Hebrew history and literature,[2] bent on shaping it into a

---

[1]Cf. Skinner's contention (Isaiah, p. xlvi) that the term Mighty One of Israel is obviously borrowed by the various writers from the Blessing of Jacob.

[2]Cf. G. A. Smith, Isaiah XL-LXVI, p. 59 f.

coördinated whole with such editing as seemed necessary to make it an essentially religious document, not reluctant to add their own work toward that end, and with enough historic sense and literary empathy so that their work really does reflect the times (to a puzzling extent at least) in which the poems were laid, but with just enough historic inaccuracies to be quite bewildering? Lest what I say here be misunderstood, may I go ahead of my presentation of evidence and suggest that perhaps the Priestly School were not the only religious group busy during the exile, and that although they dominated the revision of the Hebrew literature at this time, true to the supreme genius of their race and religion, they did not exclude the minorities, protesting or otherwise, from the final result.

Since critical opinion generally assigns an earlier date than that of Second Isaiah to these Songs, but has been universally reluctant to date them specifically, we might suggest the possibility of their being the work of the school out of which Second Isaiah came -- perhaps of an admired teacher.

We cannot pass on from our discussion of Is. 44:8 without mention of Baethgen's theory, quoted by Cheyne,[1] which makes the author of Deut. 32 the inventor of the divine title צוּר (singular form) which is used here.

---

[1] Introduction, p. 270.

With Is. 45:8:

Pour down, O heavens, from above,
And let the clouds rain righteousness.

Compare Deut. 32:2a:

May my message drop as rain,
My speech distil as dew. [1]

Read in their contexts, the two passages, both with such irresistible poetic beauty, such eloquent religion, seem to have an undeniable relationship, but it does not seem to be one of "dependence" on either side. So might the same poet have expressed himself at different times on different, yet fundamentally similar subjects. Throughout these chapters -- Is. 43-45 and Deut. 32 -- there is a similarity of thought and mode of expression much more fundamental than conscious imitation. There are no quotations, such as an imitator would surely use. But a first-rate poet does not, I think, quote one of his own poems in another. Neither, probably, would an original thinker deliberately quote a teacher, even one to whom there was sincere devotion. But the pupil might well subconsciously adopt vocabulary, style, mode of expression, and above all, use the same sources.

There is probably always a tendency in literary criticism to assume the inferiority of the secondary passage. But this need not be so. Great teachers may have even greater pupils who are nevertheless indebted

---

[1] Cf. Is. 55:10, sq.

to them for both vocabulary and ideas. There are great similarities in these chapters, but whether it points to identity of authorship, from different periods of the author's life, or a close master-pupil relationship, I could only guess. In light of our discussion of 44:8 and its affinities, my guess here would favor the latter (master-pupil) explanation.

The idea of God "carrying" (נָשָׂא) Israel is perhaps too common in Hebrew literature for its occurance in both Second Isaiah and Deut. 32 to be significant. Still, we may note the following passages:

> Whom I have carried as a load from birth,
> Whom I have born as a burden from the womb. (Is. 46:3)[1]
>
> In his love and pity he redeemed them,
> He took them up and carried them all the days
> of old. (Is. 63:9)
>
> He guarded them . . . . . like an eagle. . . . .
> Carrying them on its pinions. (Deut. 32:11)

We should also mention:

> The Lord God carried you as a man carries his son,
> all the way of your journey. (Deut. 1:31)
>
> How I bore you on eagle's wings and brought you
> to myself. (Ex. 19:4-E)

The Deut. 1 passage would seem to be the closest to

---

[1]Cheyne, Prophecies I, p. 302, says the figure of the father-nurse found elsewhere is inadequate for Second Isaiah, and that he here gives a more highly-colored picture.. Cf. Ps. 28:9, Hos. 11:3.

Second Isaiah, since the figure is human. Deut. 32 certainly seems closely related to the E account. But the dating of all these passages is so confused, and the figure so natural a one (considering the wide use of the word צור) that speculation as to relationships do not seem to yield much. If, of course, we suggest a unity of authorship for Second Isaiah and the Song, it would presuppose the author's acquaintance with E. But of this there is little doubt anyway.[1]

Let us consider next Is. 46:9:

> Remember the former days of old
> For it is I who am God and there is no other,
> The God, and there is none like me.

Deut. 32:7 ff., seems like an expansion (or is this a summary?) of the same idea: God demonstrating his uniqueness in the history of his people:

> Remember the days of old,
> Review the years, age after age,
> Ask your father to inform you,
> Your elders to tell you.

This is exactly what Second Isaiah does, going back to the history and legend and myth of his people in order to prove the supremecy of their God. Referring to

---

[1] Cf. Is. 41:4 where E seemed back of both the Second Isaiah and the Deut.32 passages. See also the discussion of Is. 40:5, p. 69, ante, where both Second Isaiah and Deuteronomy display a more "humanized" version of the "Horeb" source.

the idea of the Godhead in the last line of the Second Isaiah passage, Cheyne also recalls "the Elohim of my father . . . . . and the Awe of Isaac" in Gen. 31:42 (E)[1] but there seems no reason for seeing relationship to the Genesis passage. As between the Second Isaiah and the Deuteronomy passages, the generally accepted rule that the longer passage is usually the dependent one (i.e. D) is not evidence of a compulsive character when the actual verbal relationship is no closer than here.

The relationship is not so much one of actual words in the Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah passages, as it is emphasis: the complete theocentricity of the writer's theology. Second Isaiah and the author of Deut. 32 both say in effect: Look at history and you must realize that however incomprehensible from our limited viewpoint, in the perspectives of time, God's acts are purposive, moral, and filled with lovingkindness for his people -- which eventually includes all men.

Again in chapter 48 we come to the theme of Yahweh's self-vindication and a similarity to Deut. 32 which precludes exhaustive treatment in short scope. See, e.g., Is. 48:5 f.:

---

[1] Prophecies I, p. 303.

I announced them to you before they came,
Lest you should say, "My idol did them. . . . . "
You heard this and now it is all fulfilled,

or Is. 48:11:

For my own sake, my own sake, I do this,
And how should my name be profaned?

With this compare Deut. 32:26 ff.:

I would have said, "I will cut them in pieces,
I will extinguish the memory of them from man,"
Except that I dreaded irritation from the enemy,
Lest their foes should misinterpret it,
Lest they should say, "It is my might that has
triumphed,
And not at all the Lord who did this."

The motive of self-vindication, a favorite concept with Second Isaiah, occurs in concrete terms in the Deuteronomy passage. The shorter, more concise, Second Isaiah material seems to have a superiority, but this is largely a matter of subjective judgment, and does not include a suggestion of priority. In the discussion of Is. 46:9, we also found the Deuteronomy passage to be longer. The author of the Song does not seem quite so conscious of, or master of, his literary tools, and more under the influence of the true Deuteronomic vocabulary (therefore earlier?). This would not preclude even identity of authorship. Most authors have their greater and lesser moments, as well as less and more mature years. It is impossible to be sure what the relationship is.

Possible relations of these passages to Gen. 18:18 and 22:17 (J) concerning God's revelation of his plans to Abraham are discussed under 48:12, in the section on the Law and the Servant.

We must pause in our discussion of this passage to take notice of Ezek. 20, another presentation of Israel's history. Ezek. 20:9 says:

> But in dealing with them I had regard for my honor, that it might not be profaned in the sight of the nations.

This seems to have a definite relationship to the Second Isaiah and Deuteronomy passages just quoted. But just what that relationship is is not apparent. Prohibitions against profaning the name of the Lord, in Lev. 18:21, 19:12, 21:6,[1] can scarcely be credited with inspiring any of these passages.

A most interesting matter to note is that Ezek. 20:9 occurs in relatively the same position in its context as the similar Deut. 32:27. The Ezekiel passage occurs well-integrated in the middle of Ezekiel's prose presentation. And the material as presented by Ezekiel shows a most interesting affinity to Deut. 32. There can be little doubt of the shorter, more poetic passage from the Song having priority as between the two.

---

[1] 18:12: You must not dedicate any of your children to the service of Molech; you must not profane

Ezekiel is distinctly inferior and not the sort of thing to which a poet would go for inspiration. But granting Deut. 32 precedence over Ezekiel does not answer our problem about Second Isaiah and Deut. 32, more than to assure us that Deut 32 was not a distinctly late writing dependent on Second Isaiah. Either it was earlier or contemporary.

Is. 48:13:

When I call them, they stand up together,

is translated by Torrey "whenever I call to their host",[1] following the LXX. Thus he finds a reference to Deut. 4:19, 32:8.[2] There is so much evidence in the same direction that it makes little difference whether we accept this argument based on the LXX to show relationship to Deut. 32.

---

the name of the Lord; 19:12: You must not take a false oath in my name, and so profane the name of your God, of me, the Lord; 21:6 : Thy (priests) must be holy to their God and not profane the name of their God.

[1] Second Isaiah, p. 244.

[2] Ibid, p. 377. He reads בני אל with LXX in 32:8.

The passage beginning with Is. 55:10:

> For as the rain comes down. . . . .
> So shall the word that goes out of my mouth . . . . .

bears a marked similarity to Is. 45:8 and to Deut.32:2, which have already been discussed. Again we must say that conscious imitation of the Deuteronomy passage would undoubtedly have yielded more direct quotation, less similarity of feeling. The difference is such as might occur between the writings of one person at different periods of his life.. As to priority, arbitrary standards as used between two authors would not be acceptable if there really is identity of authorship, or if, as we have previously suggested as a possibility, the pupil was exceeding the master. Much further study of the context of Deut. 32 would be necessary before hazarding an opinion, and we should probably also want to consider Ezek. 20 again.

To say with Skinner that Is. 58:14:

> I will make you ride in triumph over the heights
> of the earth,
> And will give you the heritage of Jacob, your
> father to enjoy,

is "apparently a quote" from Deut. 32:13:[1]

> He made them to mount the heights of the earth,
> And they ate the products of the fields,

seems too strong, but it is certainly a conscious reference to 32:11-13. The reference to Jacob

---

[1] Isaiah, p. 168.

corresponds to Deut. 32:9:

> While the Lord's apportionment was his own people,
> Jacob was the allotment for him to hold.

Cheyne sees the correspondence with riding over the heights of the earth not in the eagle reference, but still with Deut. 32:13 (quoted above), 33:28:[1]

> (He) settled Israel in security. . . . .
> With the heavens, too, dropping dew.

This relationship to 33:28 is much less evident.

Torrey thinks that Is. 58:13-14 is not original.[2] But presuming that it is, I suggest that the similarities to Deut. 32, in view of our other findings, is evidence for the authorship of the Song by Second Isaiah or someone very close to him in his religious thinking.

Is. 59:5, the "viper's egg" passage, has somewhat the same spirit as Deut. 32:33 (as suggested by Skinner[3]) but there seems no real grounds for claiming relationship to the dragons and cobras there.

---

[1] Prophecies II. p. 168.

[2] Second Isaiah, p. 439. He finds it by the same author who wrote Is. 56:2-6.

[3] Isaiah, p. 171.

One of the most interesting passages for our inquiry is Is. 63:9:

> It was no messenger nor angel but his own presence
> that saved them.
> In his love and pity he redeemed them,
> He took them up and carried them all the days of old.

In Deut. 32:8, God

> assigned the realms of the nations to the various deities, while the Lord's apportionment was his own people.

In Deut. 32:12 we are told that

> The Lord alone was their leader, and no foreign god was with him.

With the idea of God's "carrying" his people, compare the eagle metaphore, Deut. 32:11, 12, which has previously been discussed. The rebellion referred to in Is. 63:10 is explained specifically in Deut. 32:15.

The Deuteronomic material seems to have priority here, for there is a greater element of protest in Second Isaiah against some other tradition, to which we find the key in Ex. 14:19 (E): the angel who was accostomed to go in front of the army of Israel.[1] See also Ex. 23:20.

Deut. 32 goes back in this respect to Ex. 33:14 (J) , where, reminded by Moses that this is his very own people, God says, "I will go along myself and lead you."

---

[1] Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 105, seems too early with his angel who is in a transition stage from "face"

No single word is the same in the J and Second Isaiah[1] passages, though the thought is so similar. Deuteronomy 32 is the intermediary step. The authors of both Is. 63 and the Deut. 32 passages knew not only the E (Horeb) tradition which dominates Deuteronomy, but also J, which in this case was preferred.

The protest in Second Isaiah is probably not so much against a popular current interest in Persian angelology, as against reading such concepts into the ancient Hebrew idea of פָּנִים. We have discussed several instances in Second Isaiah which may be regarded as protest against Persian or Babylonian demonology or dualism.[2] Second Isaiah might readily have objected to the E interest in angels for the very reason that it opened the way for either Persian or Babylonian demonology to get a foothold in Hebrew religious thought.

---

and "name" as a phase of divine manifestation (if his theory will hold at all.) Cf. Ewald, Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott II, p. 289 (quoted by Cheyne), who says this is a "metaphorical equivalent for the angel continually in waiting for the commands of the heavenly king."

[1]We are presuming, tentatively, for purposes of discussion, the originality of this much questioned c. 63. See discussion p. 42 ff., ante.

[2]Even to admit Persian origin does not mean, necessarily, that all such material belongs to the "Persian period". Ideas travel faster than armies and dualism -- even Persian dualism -- was probably heard of in Babylon before the arrival of Cyrus. See, on the other hand, Cheyne's contention that Persian religion was not yet dualistic, etc., in the section on the Creation.

Deut. 32 seems not to object to the idea of the "various deities", as long as the Lord takes care of Israel himself. This, we have already pointed out, is probably an example of late poetry rather than early theology. But it may also well be evidence that Deut. 32 was written by Second Isaiah or someone of like mind before demonology came to be recognized as a theological menace to Hebraism. Unless we can decide as to whether that menace was from Babylon or Persia, however, our conclusions can only be relative as to dating: that if the close relationship we have suggested exists between Second Isaiah and Deut. 32, the Deuteronomy passage is slightly earlier.

Consider next Is. 63:16:

> For thou art our Father . . . . .
> Thou, O Lord, art our Father, ...
> Our redeemer of old is thy name;

Is. 64:8: Yet now, O Lord, thou art our Father; and Deut. 32:6: Is he not your Father who created you?

The idea of God as father is common enough (Ex. 4:22, Hos. 11:1, Is. 1:2, Jer. 3:4,19, 31:9,20, Mal. 1:6, 2:10) but the direct statement of Fatherhood as it occurs here seems peculiar to the author or authors of Second Isaiah and Deut. 32.

It is interesting to note here that 63:15[1] is as close as we have to a direct quotation from the Pentateuch, and that it is from the code itself (26:15)[2] with which there is otherwise rather slight affinity in Second Isaiah.. This sudden tendency to quote inclines us to once more suspicion the authorship of c. 63.[3] What at first looks like evidence of unity of authorship of Is. 40-66, in the fact that similarities to Deut. 32 continue throughout, turns out to be negative if we discount 58:14, which even Torrey questions, and 63 and 65, which Eissfeldt repudiates. Even accepting all these passages as original, relationships to Deut. 32 are far less in the latter half of the book. But this is understandable if we are right that the first half of Second Isaiah finds its theme in balancing the proposed return against the entrance into the promised land

---

[1]
Look down from the heavens and see
From thy holy and glorious abode.
Where is thy zeal and thy might,
Thy yearning pity and mercy?
Restrain thyself not!

[2]
Look down from the heavens, thy sacred dwelling place,
and bless thy people Israel..

[3]A late insertion, written after Deut. 32 had been appended to the code? Eissfeldt, Einleitung, p. 387, puts 56-66 in general about 520-516 B.C.; 63:7-64:12, after 587; 65 (see sq.), 400-200.

(likewise the historic emphasis of Deut. 32), while the theme of the latter chapters, restoration on the land, has no such affinity with the subject matter of the Song.

The last reference we must examine in this section is Is. 65:3-7:

> A people who provoke me to my face continually,
> Offering sacrifices in gardens. . . . . etc.

Compare Deut. 32:16:

> They vexed him with abominable practices,

or Deut. 32:21:

> They provoked me to jealousy with what is no god,
> They vexed me with their vanities.

There is a decided similarity of thought and vocabulary but the Second Isaiah passage goes into detail in listing some of the abominable practices and vanities. The charge seems to be against cultic practices in general rather than against violations of any specific code. Since the time of Saul, for instance, we know that there had been an attempt to do away with necromancy,[1] and apparently it was still practiced.

I doubt if the dependence is direct enough to warrant trying to establish the priority of either passage. The Second Isaiah passage is, of course, much longer

---

[1] I Sam. 28:3.

and more specific than those in Deut. 32, but the Song would scarcely be the place to go into such a listing. The similarities merely further confirm an already established conviction of close relationship between the thought and expression in Second Isaiah and the Song.[1]

---

[1]The Second Isaiah reference can scarcely be even secondarily to Lev. 17:5 (H), providing that the sacrifices which Israelites have been accostomed to sacrifice in the country at large now be brought to the tent of meeting. The protest against the "tiles" can scarcely refer to the "dressed stones" of Ex. 20:25 (E). Any correspondence between Is. 65:6, "See it stands written before me, I will not keep silent", and Deut. 32:34, "It is stored up within me, sealed up in my treasuries," seems too far-fetched, as do those between the Second Isaiah passage as a whole, listing those on whom the Lord will requite judgment for their cultic practices, and Deut. 18:11, forbidding all kinds of magicians (and listing them). Nor can we find significance in comparing Is. 65:4 denouncing those "in whose vessels is the broth of unclean meats" with Deut. 14:8 or Lev. 11:2 ff., both listing clean and unclean foods. Verbal relationships are lacking and the idea is too common to have significance.. Attitudes toward the Law will be discussed in the next section.

The foregoing comparisons suggest:

1. The most obvious relationship of Second Isaiah is with the Song of Moses in Deut. 32.

2. Comparison of individual passages fails to give an adequate picture of the close relationship. The recurrent theme of the uniqueness of Yahweh and his self-vindication, and the similarity of expression and vocabulary employed, is far more obvious from a general reading than from a comparison of specimen passages. This is particularly true in regard to Is. 43-45 and 48.

3. Possible unity of authorship has been suggested by Torrey[1] but he does not press the suggestion and critical opinion has not seemed to move much in this direction. Examination of the passages seems to indicate either such unity of authorship or a close -- perhaps a pupil-teacher -- relationship. Since critical opinion, while apparently reluctant to date the Song, would tend to give it an independent

---

[1] Second Isaiah, p. 344. Torrey says Deut. 32 and 33 "remind us of Second Isaiah in every line and might well have been written by him." Note also the frequent parallels to Deut. 32 in Cheyne's list of late expressions in Second Isaiah (Intro. p. 260 ff.)

existence prior to incorporation in Deuteronomy, and probably earlier than Second Isaiah, a more detailed study might consider the possibility of this having been the work of Second Isaiah's teacher. Such a study should also include consideration of the Songs of Jacob, Hannah, David, etc.

4. The continued relationships to Deut. 32 through 40-66 are not sufficient to establish unity of authorship for Second Isaiah (i.e. 40-66); members of the same "school" might all have admired the author of the Song. Moreover, every passage where similarity was noted in the second half has been the subject of critical question by competent authorities. But in our section dealing with Noah we have suggested that the change of theme accounts for fewer references to Deut. 32 in the latter chapters.

E. The Hope for the Future: the Law or the Servant

The centrality to the Priestly writer's thinking of the promulgation of a code of ceremonial laws for the guidance of Israel in her future course, is usually conceded.

Our Second Isaiah materials, on the other hand, are unrewarding so far as definite references which seem to advocate specific codes are concerned.. We noted one direct reference, though a questioned passage, to the Deuteronomic code proper (Is. 63:15, Deut. 26:15) and shall find others which suggest acquaintance with much of the introductory and supplementary material.[1]

The references to Leviticus are about what we should expect from our investigation up to this point: by no means propoganda for the new code. We have suggested possible antagonism on the part of Second Isaiah to P's approach, and differences in their viewpoint and theology. Before discussing this matter further, we had best examine such passages in Isaiah 40-66 as may throw light on the author's attitude toward legal matters.

---

[1]The many references to the Song and Blessing in Deut. 32, 33, have, of course, no significance for this phase of our inquiry.

First, we must remember that we are reading poetry, and that such passages as 40:16:

> The Lebanon itself is not sufficient for fuel
> Nor the beasts enough for burnt offerings,

are simply poetic symbols from common Semitic practice. In the same class is the highly eschatological 60:7:

> Rams of Nebaioth. . . . . shall mount my altar as a well-pleasing sacrifice.

Equally unprofitable for this inquiry are the passages which voice the usual Israelite protests against idol worship (e.g., c. 44 and 46) or the cultic practices (50:10-11, 65:3-12). There is no difference of viewpoint among Old Testament writers on this point: idols are "abominable" to all.

We may also eliminate (and gratefully in view of the critical problems involved) 43:23 ff.:

> Have you not brought me sheep for your burnt offerings . . . . .
> While you burdened me with your sins,
> Wearied me with your iniquities?

Prophets from the time of Amos had delivered the unwelcome message that the Lord would not accept sacrifice as a substitute for justice, nor did any code claim that he would. Chapter 59 fails to even suggest sacrifice as a means of atonement for the transgressions and iniquities, such as "speaking cruel and defiant words"

or "conceiving and uttering lies from the heart" which "have been a barrier between you and your God." Return to the ways of peace and justice seem to be the demands of the Lord. 43:23 is Second Isaiah's graphic statement of a common prophetic protest. That protest was not against sacrifice as a symbol, but against forgetting its symbolic nature.[1]

---

[1]Cheyne (Prophecies, p. 279) looks on this passage as evidence that for Second Isaiah "the sacrificial system was altogether no part of his requirements (cf. Jer. 6:20, 7:21-23). . . . . Prayer was the only form of worship Jehovah required. How this can have been said by a prophet who had before him the authoratative sacrificial code is, no doubt, a difficult question." This is presumed to mean that neither Second Isaiah nor Jeremiah knew the Levitical Code or at least regarded it as authoratative. It could be, Cheyne admits, a rhetorical exaggeration. But it is hard to see the viewpoint of Ewald, Delitzsch and Hengstenberg (quoted by Cheyne) who find it "not at all decisive as to the real or assumed viewpoint of the author." Whatever it means it seems rather important.

The most likely interpretation seems to me to be that of protest against the re-adoption of the sacrificial cult as part of the official religion of Israel. The prophets had always held it futile; the exile had proved that Hebrew religion could survive without it. Experience had proved that the common people could not remember its symbolic character. Why burden the prophetic religion of Israel with such a ritualistic practice?

We may also notice here the mention of sweet cane (קָנֶה), which is also referred to in Jer. 6:20. It is an ingredient of the oil with which the priests were to be annointed, the recipe being given in Ex.30:23 (P). There is no evidence, however, in either Jeremiah or Second Isaiah of its being used in a compound and these references are not to be taken as approval of the P formula; they more likely refer to the spontaneous offering of which the P ceremonial was a refinement.

Chapter 66, whose originality is very generally questioned, goes further and seems to actually attack the sacrificial system as such:

> But he who slaughters an ox, as well as he who slays a man,
> He who sacrifices a sheep, as well as he who strangles a dog,
> He who brings an oblation, as well as he who sheds the blood of swine,
> He who makes a memorial offering of frankincense, as well as he who blessas an idol --
> These chose their own ways,
> And delight in their abominations.

Skinner sees in the passage the coupling of four legitimate sacrificial acts with four "detestable" ones, with two possible interpretations: (1) that one is as bad as the other (2) that those who do the first are at the same time doing the second-- openly worshipping Yahweh, privately "delighting in abominations". He sees the possibility, though he repudiates it, of the preceding verses being a protest against the rebuilding of the Temple:[1]

> The heavens are my throne,
> And the earth is my footstool;
> What manner of house,then,would you build for me,
> What manner of place for my residence?

At any rate, the whole seems to be a protest against the authoratative character of the sacrificial system. (We can scarcely accept the alternative explanation that it is vegetarian propoganda.) And

---

[1] Isaiah, p. 223.

though it might be interpreted as particularly opposed to the cumpulsive character of the regulations of the Priestly code, if taken strictly, it would be just as opposed to the slaughtering of animals for food as authorized in Deut. 12. Probably the best interpretation is that the slaughtering of the ox has not, of itself, any more propitiatory effect than slaying a man would have.[1]

This still leaves a number of passages to consider. We shall take them up as they occur in Second Isaiah, starting with 42:21:

> The Lord was pleased for his righteousness sake
> to make his instruction great and glorious,

and 42:24:

> Was it not the Lord against whom they sinned
> And in whose ways they would not walk,
> And to whose instruction they would not listen?

The question naturally arises as to what "instruction" is here referred to. Certainly it cannot be P's code, for punishment has already been administered for disobedience. Neither is there any evidence that the reference

---

[1]Cf. B. D. Erdmans, "Reflections on a Synogogue Inscription", Quantulacumque (1937) p. 37, seeing in sacrifice of animals "a thorne in the otherwise mutually agreeable relations between Persians and Jews," and this passage as propitiatory to Persia.

is to any specific early legislation, but more likely to the whole accumulation of Hebrew literature, containing the Word of God.[1]

This is borne out by 48:18:

> If only you had hearkened to my commands
> Then would your welfare have been like a river,
> And your righteousness like the waves of the sea;
> Your descendents would have been like the sand,
> And your offspring like the dust of the earth.

The reference seems to be either to Gen. 18:18 or 22:16 ff. (both J). In the latter, Yahweh "swears by himself" (in a manner quite typical of Second Isaiah) that he will bless Abraham and make his descendents as numerous as the stars or the sands, and through him all the nations shall evoke blessings upon one another (another idea popular with Second Isaiah) "just because you heeded

---

[1] G. A. Smith, Book of Isaiah XL-LXVI, p. 61 f., says the exile was the opportunity of the scribes, but the despair of the priests.

> "There is no religious practice more apparent through our prophecies than the reading of Scripture. Israel's hope was neither in sacrifice nor in temple, nor in vision, nor in lot, but in God's written Word; and when a new prophet arose. . . . .he did not appeal for his authorization, as previous prophets had done, to the fact of his call or inspiration, but it was enough for him to point to some former word of God and cry, 'See! At last the day has dawned for the fulfilment of that!' Throughout Second Isaiah this is what the anonymous prophet cares to establish -- that the facts of today fit the promise of yesterday. We shall not understand our great prophecy unless we realize a people rising from fifty years close study of Scripture, in strained expectation of its immediate fulfilment."

my injunction". 18:18 couples the blessing with the rhetorical question:"Shall I hide what I am about to do from Abraham?", suggesting Second Isaiah's "from the first I spoke not in secret" (45:19, 48:16). Second Isaiah seems to be regretting that the Hebrew conduct has made fulfilment of the J prophecy impossible.[1] Abraham is the archetype of the obedient servant. If only Israel, like him, had listened to the Lord's instruction! See Is. 41:8 ff., 51:2, where, as elsewhere, the idea of the call is coupled with that of instruction. The Lord has not left his servant Israel without constant witness to his Word, in the prophetic tradition. No code of laws, old or new, can take the place of a willingness in men's hearts to receive and obey the Word of God.

Second Isaiah was too close to Jeremiah not to have shared his disillusionment and skepticism in regard to the complete efficacy of any institution. He was too familiar with Israel's history and her religious literature not to have been aware of what happened to the prophetic traditions when they were "stabalized" and made "authoratative" in the Book of Deuteronomy.

---

[1] Again in the reference to the promise in Gen. 32:12 (J), there is mention of the sands,and the reference is apparently to Abraham (Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 8 contra). But Bewer thinks this is late (Literature of the O.T.,p.73. Cf. Hos. 1:10, Is. 1:22, both of which couple the mention of the sands of the sea promise with that of the remnant.

The "instruction" is that to which the Lord daily awakens his Servant, "to hear as disciples do" (Is. 50:4 f.).

Again one finds the linking of the servant idea with a distinctly non-legalistic concept in regard to the place of the Gentiles in Second Isaiah's eschatological program. Perhaps we should have classed the prophecy that "to me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear" (45:22), the "light to the nations" passage (49:6), and the promise that "my house shall be called a house of prayer to all peoples" (56:7), with the "highly poetic" passages which we eliminated at the beginning of our discussion. But this universal attitude, which we have already noted, particularly in our discussion of Noah, is so contrary to the particularism of both D and P as to deserve special mention here. The servant is not to avoid contact with the world, as is the priest, as prescribed in the Holiness code (Lev. 21). For the self sacrifice of the servant, it is "too slight a thing" that the Lord should raise up only the tribes of Jacob and restore Israel. The servant is to be "a light to the nations" that God's salvation "may reach to the ends of the earth" (49:6). The self sacrifice of the servant far outweighs the ritual sacrifice of the priest.

Is. 50:1 seems to deal with a matter on which we should find light in the codes:

> Where is your mother's writ of divorce,
> With which I put her away?
> Or who is the creditor of mine,
> To whom I sold you?
> Lo! It was for your sins that you were sold,
> And it was for her transgressions that your mother
> was put away.

The nearest we have to a sanction for selling children are the regulations put upon the practice in the Covenant Code (Ex. 21:7 - E). The reference to the writ of divorce seems directly to Deut. 24:1, but there is no reason for suspecting literary dependence. Both are probably just figures taken from prevalent customs. Torrey's interpretation that having been given no formal bill (definitely repudiated) Israel may be taken back seems unnecessarily legalistic.[1] The mataphor of the rejected wife had been common since Hosea. (Cf. the invitation to the apostate wife and children to return, Jer. 3:8.) Second Isaiah uses the metaphor of the rejected wife again 54:6 ff., 62:4, 63:10, and that of the children sold in 52:3. The latter is in accord with the Deuteronomic formula in Judges 2:14, 3:8, etc., and the question in Deut. 32:30. There is no reason to see literary dependence between any of the passages, nor implied sanction of any code in the Second Isaiah passage.

---

[1] Second Isaiah, p. 390.

Is. 52:11 lends itself to a variety of interpretations:

> Away! away! go out thence; touch nothing unclean!
> Go out from the midst of her; keep yourselves pure,
> You who bear the vessels of the Lord.

Torrey characterizes the passage as "one of the poet's flashlight pictures of the flight from Egypt" -- exactly like 48:20. מִשָּׁם, thence, means, he believes, "from this modern Egyptian bondage". Cf. also 43:16, 51:10. He finds that "touch nothing unclean" contains an allusion to the symbolism of the unleavened bread (leaven standing for corruption) "as well as the fact that they were going out to worship Yahweh, hence the mention of the cultus utensils in the next clause." The phrase צְאוּ מִתּוֹךְ is from Ex. 12:31 (E) and חִפָּזוֹן, v. 12, from Ex. 12:11. The thought of Egypt is so constantly in the writer's mind, Torrey says, that the suffix in בְּתוֹכָהּ is sufficient. But our investigation of the question of the Exodus led us to the conviction that the flight from Egypt was by no means constantly in the writer's mind, and this being the case there can be little reason to inject it here.

On the other hand, one must remark an analogy to the Holiness Code, e.g., Lev. 22:2:

> Tell Aaron and his sons to be careful about the sacred gifts of the Israelites, which they consecrate to me, and not to profane my holy name . . . . . etc.

Is there a possibility that 52:11 is one of those fine bits of sarcasm, of which we know Second Isaiah to be capable (e.g., the description of the idol factory, 44:9-20)? Occurring as it does by the side of the Suffering Servant passage, one almost suspects it of being such. And if so, it must be counted as knowledge of, but opposition to, official adoption of the Holiness Code. The Suffering Servant does not fear "contamination" but willing takes upon himself the sins of the world.

With the Suffering Servant passage, the last of these references to be written before the return (if our theory as to dating is correct, and if we may presume something like chronological order in 40-55), we reach the climax and the crux of our discussion. Not in legal codes and an idea of "separateness" must Israel find her future, but in service and sacrifice for the cause of a universal God whose very nature demanded the ultimate redemption not of Israel alone, but of the very ends of the earth. Couldn't the Hebrew people see it? Wouldn't they believe? Nowhere, perhaps, is there such a plea for religious insight on the part of the listeners as we have in Is. 52-53. But the momentum of Judaism was too strong. The appeal of sacrifice and sin offerings

and authoritative codes was greater than that of Israel herself becoming a sin offering for the redemption of the Gentiles. Azazel (Lev. 16:1-28-P)[1] had more popular appeal than a Messianic savior.

Pfeiffer, dating Second Isaiah before the Priestly editor, says:

> "The idealistic and poetic solution of Second Isaiah was obviously repulsive to the Priestly authors. That the universal God should select Israel as the sacrificial lamb offered up for the redemption of all Gentiles no later Jew could believe, to the best of our knowledge, least of all the sacerdotal class." 2

Antagonism there certainly was between the two schools of thought, but the evidence of the element of protest in Is. 40-55 is that the two were written to the same situation, the Priestly document by its very nature assuming the dignity of authority, while Second Isaiah represented the voice of prophetic protest.

---

[1] J.M.P. Smith, Origin and History of Hebrew Law, p.154: "This is the only reference to the scapegoat in the entire O.T. While it occurs only in the Priestly Code at this one place, it is practically certain that it was an old rite, dating far back in Hebrew history. The Priestly Code by its very nature was especially interested in old rites and ceremonies, and made every effort to preserve and perpetuate them." Elsewhere (p. 59) Smith speaks of just rewards as the principle back of Deuteronomy and the pre-exilic prophets. In view of the facts of experience "it became necessary to search for a new interpretation of the problem of suffering. Such an attempt was made first of all by the authors of Isaiah, chapters 40-55, in the 'Servant Songs' and later by the author of the book of Job. But the controlling provision in the legal provisions has remained essentially the same down to the present day. Conformity to the law is commendable; violation of law is an offense against social well-being and must be punished."

[2] IOT, p. 196. Cf. Stamm, op. cit. p. 40.

Concerning Is. 52-53, S. A. Cook says that like Ikhnaton and Josiah, the great prophet had been disillusioned (cf. the optimism of chapter 40) and finds his hope for the future in the "forerunner of Jesus" of c. 53.[1] But from the first, Second Isaiah was too much a follower of Jeremiah to have had much faith in the efficacy of institutions, or to think that more and more laws or rebuilding a temple could be the final answer. Yet he was no antinomian. Second Isaiah seems to have raised the voice of protest, but once it became evident that an authoritative code was the desire of the majority, the evidence from later chapters seems to indicate that he acquiesced. As to whether that acquiescence involved acceptance of the P code, we must look for evidence in the latter chapters.[2] It is quite possible that just as Jeremiah became disillusioned as to the ultimate value of institutions, so Second Isaiah became convinced of their practical necessity.[3] 56:1 is our best evidence:

Keep the Law and do what is right.

But acquiescence would not mean that the prophet was through: there was still room for interpretation. 56:2, e.g., is

---

[1] "Servant of the Lord", Expos. Times 34, p. 440.

[2] Malachi seems to have still considered Deuteronomy as the official "law of Moses" in his day (4:4)

[3] H. Wheeler Robinson, "Law and Religion in Israel" in Law and Religion, p. 63, quotes C.G. Montefiore's Hibbert Lectures, "The Law was far less a misfortune in virtue of its legalism than because of its heterogeneous contents", and adds that we must remember the soul of religion always needs a body.

his idea of what it means to "keep the Sabbath":[1]

> Happy the man who keeps the Sabbath by not profaning it,
> And keeps his hand from doing any evil.

The Sabbath passage suggests relation to Gen. 2:2 (P), Lev. 19:3, 30 (H),26:2 (H), etc. The following verses, inviting aliens and eunuchs to also keep the Sabbath seems contrary to Deut. 23:1 ff., which excludes eunuchs, Moabites and Amorites,[2] as well as to later later Jewish law expressly forbidding aliens to "keep the Sabbath".[3]

To love the Lord and be his servants (56:6)[4] has a Deuteronomic flavor (cf. Deut. 6:5, 13, 11:1) as does the

---

[1]The passage is, of course, much disputed, and may well be the work of a late "Sabbath editor". See Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 429. Cf. Is. 58:14. The institution of the Sabbath appeared in the earliest codes (Ex. 34:21) but emphasis upon it is late.

[2]But Driver, Deuteronomy, p. 259, and others, make the point that the Deuteronomic legislation is not against the victims of the eastern harem system, but against the religious mutilations of the Galli, etc. This is not, therefore, contrary to (hence not a reference to) D legislation, but is against some intollerant and exclusive spirit among the leaders. So, also Skinner, Isaiah, p. 148.

[3]D. M. Kay, "Noachian Precepts", HERE IX, p. 380.

[4]Skinner thinks the idea of service, or ministry, suggests Gen. 39:4, 40:4 and especially the priestly service to God in the sanctuary. Cf. 60:7, 61:6. Certainly the idea of the servant is typical enough of Second Isaiah so that there is no call to look for sources of any ramification of the idea which we find in his writings.

admonition to rejoice before Yahweh (56:7). Gladness in the worship of the Lord is distinctly Deuteronomic (12:7, 12, 18, etc.). But the passage indicates saturation in rather than reference to Deuteronomy.

Just as chapter 56 deals with right and wrong ideas about keeping the Sabbath, so c. 58 concerns itself with true and false fasting. But is it halachah on the P code provisions of Lev. 16:29, 23:27 (H), Nu. 29:7, or protest in favor of Deuteronomy's more cheerful spirit? Cheyne points out that "humbled of soul" becomes the technical phrase for fast in Levitical legislation.[1] But what the attitude of the author of Is. 58 is (he uses both terms) is not clear from verse 5:

> Can this be the fast I chooose--
> A day for man to humble himself,
> To bow down his head like a bulrush,
> And grovel in sackcloth and ashes?
> Will you call this a fast,
> A day of pleasure to the Lord?

Is the rebuke that the people have not fasted according to this program, or that they could have been so mistaken as to think such a fast would please the Lord? Either the passage is propoganda for a cheerful (Deuteronomic) spirit, or simply the customary prophetic appeal for sincerity of heart as opposed to form and ritual.

---

[1] Prophecies II, p. 78. עִנָּה נַפְשׁ (58:3,5) is "a phrase from P" (Lev. 16:29,31; 23:27,29,32, Nu. 29:7; 30:14.) (Intro., p. 272.)

There is little more to say concerning the Sabbath passage, 58:13-14, than has been said concerning the earlier passage. The finding of delight in the Lord and his day may, again, indicate a Deuteronomic preference.[1]

G. A. Smith sees in 58:2 a reflection of the preoccupation of the people with legalities, and in particular their intense interest in the Priestly Code after the return:

> Daily, indeed, they consult me,
> And delight to know my ways,
> Like a nation that does what is right
> And forsakes not the law of its God.
> They ask me for righteous ordinances,
> They delight to draw near to God:
> "Why have we fasted and thou seest not;
> Why have we humbled ourselves, and thou heedest not?"

This, says Smith, notes the clamour of the exiles to God for "ordinances of righteousness", i.e., "for the institution of legal and valid rites."[2] But the last two lines quoted above would rather indicate that the rites already formulated were being tried out but were not producing the practical results expected of them, and the people were calling the Lord to account for his laxness in the matter. The phrase "humbled ourselves" indicates that the Levitical regulations are under discussion. We detect a strong tinge of irony.

---

[1] This, also, may be a late insertion.

[2] Isaiah XL-LXVI, p. 60.

Similarities have been suggested between 61:1-2 (which Torrey classifies as a servant song and others see as a Cyrus passage)[1] and Lev. 25:9 (H) concerning the sounding of the trumpets for the day of atonement, and to Ex. 20:5 f. (E) and Deut. 7:9, concerning Yahweh's care for the thousandth generation. Whether the passage refers to the Year of Jubilee (Lev. 25:1-7) or to earlier legislation decreeing a "year of release" is impossible to say (Ex. 23:10 f., Deut. 15:1-11). But Cheyne calls attention to the fact that the year of grace is contrasted with the day of the Lord's vengeance.[2] And the latter certainly has no legal status. Again I think we must report no relationship to any code but a poetic allusion to a common practice and concept.

The hierarchical idea of priesthood is expressed in 61:6:

> But you shall be called the priests of the Lord,
> The ministers of our God shall you be named.

The reference seems to be rather definitely to Ex. 19:6 (E):

> You shall be a kingdom of priests to me and a holy nation,

rather than to either P or D codes.[3]

---

[1] Second Isaiah, p. 453.

[2] Prophecies II, p. 94.

[3] Hermann Schultz, Alttestamentliche Theologie, quoted, Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 95, seems to raise the question as

Is. 62:9:

> Those who have garnered the grain shall eat it
> and praise the Lord,
> And those who have gathered the vintage shall
> drink it in my holy courts,

may be interpreted that they shall be able to keep the injunctions of such passages as Deut. 12:12, 17 f., 14:23 ff., 16:9-17. Cheyne's objection, "But the whole harvest could not be eaten in the courts of the temple,"[1] seems far-fetched. The expression is, of course, figurative, as to "dwell" in Yahweh's house. Either way, the allusion is still to the D passage, or at least to the custom which it authorized. And again there is the Deuteronomic emphasis that Yahweh is to be worshipped with gladness of heart. Cf. Is. 65:14:

> Behold, my servant shall sing for gladness of heart,

and Deut. 28:47:

> Because you would not serve the Lord your God in the joy and happiness of mind that comes from an abundance of everything . . . . .

---

to which came first, the priest or the chosen nation idea. Priests, he says, were only an official representation of Israel's national idea. When Israelites had become a kingdom of priests, the gentiles would fill up the strata below. Skinner, Isiaah, p. 187, seems to see a kind of formula which might be expressed thus -- Priests: Levites: Israelites: Gentiles. Cf. Is.66:21.

[1] Prophecies II, p. 99.

Various scholars have noted Samaritan touches in the final chapters of our book.[1] To cite the plural forms "thy holy cities" (64:10) and "my mountains" (65:9) as evidence that chapters 64 and 65 are Samaritan prophecies seems unjustified, however, since Shechem would no more have admitted two holy cities or mountains than Jerusalem would. Moreover, there is much in these chapters that sounds genuinely like Second Isaiah.

Now we know that there was a movement for religious unity between north and south before the exile.[2] In this movement Jeremiah seems to have concurred. And this was a cause in which we might well expect Second Isaiah, with his liberal viewpoint, and his apparent admiration for Jeremiah, to have been interested. It is often remarked that the priestly editors carried the Deuteronomic reform to its logical conclusions. Second Isaiah did the same for the prophetic protest raised by Jeremiah. In all justice, might his voice not have raised the question of Shechem's claims to at least equal religious recognition with Jerusalem, and her right to a share in the plans for

---

[1]L. E. Browne, Early Judaism, reviewed in "Notes on Recent Exposition", Expository Times XXXII, p. 341

[2]Jer. 41:5 is the classic reference. Moses Gaster, The Samaritans, points out what he refers to as the obviously concilliatory attitude of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. He thinks (p. 15 ff.) Ezekiel was from the north and that one plan was reorganization of Palestine with religious headquarters at

reconstruction? We would not, of course, expect to find more than an accidental trace of such protest in our scriptures.[1]

Is it, indeed, absurd to venture some decided northern influence for Second Isaiah? Note his universalistic viewpoint, his admiration for Hosea and Jeremiah, his liking for the Noah literature (Northern Palestinian?),[2] his use of mythological allusions with affinities to Ras Shamra as well as Babylon, his apparent preference for D over P legislation, and his repudiation of the Egyptian captivity (Judean history?) as part of the traditions of Israel.

Mention should probably be made of 65:4, which denounces those who "eat the flesh of swine and in whose vessels is the broth of unclean meats", together with 66:17, threatening those who "eat the flesh of swine, of vermin and of mice." Clean and unclean meats are listed Deut. 14:8 ff. and Lev. 11:2 ff (no special mention of vermin or mice however.) Compare also 64:6:

Shechem, and the secular at Jerusalem. I submit that Second Isaiah would have been a more likely northern representative than Ezekiel.

[1] Cf. also 66:20, "my holy mountain Jerusalem". We would expect the word city rather than mountain, if the word Jerusalem were there originally.

[2] F. C. Burkitt, Jewish and Christian Apocalypses

We have all become like an unclean man,
And our righteous deeds like a garment defiled.

J.M.P. Smith says, "It is practically certain that the usage of clean and unclean was of great antiquity." The Deuteronomic listings were "that all may know what the standard usage is."[1] This fact that laws exist in customs or judgments before their codification is, of course, one of the greatest handicaps to the type of problem we are trying to solve. Laws concerning usage have always been evidenced by codification rather than the result of legislation, and frequently the code employs the very terminology or phraseology in which the decisions were usually handed down by the judges in deciding cases. We need look no further back than codification of our own English "common law" for evidence. We cannot tell, then, whether a writer is quoting a code or usage which preceded the code. The same is true to some extent of purely literary relationships, where the form of a maxim or poetic meter preserves the verbal form through long oral transmission.

In context, both the above passages seem to refer to obnoxious cultic practices of the day. It would be "detestable" to us to eat vermin or mice -- but on the grounds of which code?

---

[1] Origin and History of Hebrew Law, p. 57.

With Is. 65:16:

> He who swears an oath in the land must swear by
> the God of truth,

compare Deut. 6:13, which seems its logical antecedent:

> You must stand in awe of the Lord your God; him
> you must serve, and by his name you must swear.

It would seem that the reference to the Deuteronomy passage was a conscious one.

The final passage of which we must here take note is 66:20 f.:

> And men shall bring all their brothers from all
> the nations,. . . . .
> For an offering to the Lord on my holy mountain
> Jerusalem,
> Says the Lord,
> As the children of Israel bring an offering
> In a clean vessel to the house of the Lord.
> And some of these also will I take for priests,
> for Levites.

This is certainly a different conception from that of the priesthood of the Israelites in relation to the Gentiles as we have been discussing it. But Second Isaiah (even presuming this is he!) makes no pretense of being consistent. He leaves that virtue to the Priestly writer, while he exhausts avenues of thought, draws on the mythology and folklore of many systems, suggests many possibilities for the future, and coins new vocabulary to express what seems to him of the most urgent importance: that the Hebrew people, about to embark on a new phase of their history -- to make a new beginning that surely, this time,

will turn out better -- should understand the true nature of the God whose worship is to be the heart of their existence. The Priestly Code, because it made the Lord theoretically so central to Israel's existence, made it correspondingly more necessary that he be understood.

The expression "for priests, for Levites" is distinctly a Deuteronomic phrase, being there the common term for priests, who in Leviticus are "the sons of Aaron."[1] But the idea of selecting priests from Gentile proselytes is advocated in no known Hebrew code. We have already noted the radical attitude of chapter 66, as well as the fact that its originality is quite generally questioned.

---

[1]J.M.P.Smith, Origin and History of Hebrew Law, p. 82. Cf. Lev. 21:1-23, 22:1-16.

Our conclusions based on the findings in this section of the paper are as follows:

1. Throughout the book (c. 40-66) we find the customary prophetic protest against idolotry, cultic practices, or the substitution of sacrifices for morality.

2. Up to c.55, especially, there is protest against adoption of a new code as a solution to Israel's problems.

3. In the latter half of the book, the question is extremely complicated by critical problems. Passages definitely concerned with legalistic problems are usually questioned, but partly on that ground.

4. There seems to be, in the unquestioned passages, a preference for Deuteronomy as against the Levitical code. This may be interpreted as acquiescence in existing institutions but antagonism to carrying the legalizing process further by establishing an authoratative sacrificial cult.

5. Second Isaiah was not antinomian in attitude, but saw the hope for the future of Israel not in a new set of laws, but in a true understanding of God.

6. Unique with P is Azazel, ritual scapegoat for the sins of the community. Unique with Second Isaiah, up to this time, is the voluntary vicarious atonement of the Suffering Servant. These represent the answers of two schools of thought for the problems of the returning exiles.

CHAPTER III

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

A. J and E

It is scarcely necessary to cite further evidence of Second Isaiah's familiarity with these sources. The following merely represent some points of special interest.

The word גֹּאֵל , redeemer, occurs twelve times in Second Isaiah, amounting almost to a divine title. The corresponding verb occurs six times. A probable origin is the use in Gen. 48:15 f. (E):

> May the God in whose favor my fathers, Abraham and Isaac lived, the God who has been my shepherd all my life long until this day, the angel who has delivered me from all harm. . . . .

(Israel's blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh.)

The term is used by Yahweh in his first appearance to Moses in the P document (Ex. 6:6). Ex. 15:13 (E) speaks of "the people whom thou didst redeem." But cf. also Hos. 13:14, Mic. 4:10, and various references in Psalms. The verb is too common to assign a source. For the use of the noun, besides the twelve Second Isaiah passages, see Job 19:25, Ps. 19:14, 78:35, Jer. 50:34, Prov. 23:11. See also under the discussion of divine titles, sq.

Lev. 25-27 uses the root in the legalistic sense (as does Ruth 4, Jer. 32) in preference to מכר which appears in Ex. 13, 34, Nu. 18 and Deut. 7:8, 9:26, 13:5, 15:15, 21:8, 24:18. The earlier legislation, in other words, does not use קנה. Leviticus uses מכר only in 19:20, 27:27,29; it occurs Is. 50:2, 51:11.

The significance of being"called by name" as expressed in Is. 43:1:

I have called you by name, you are mine,

is common in primitive religion and occurs in various references through the Old Testament. The particular form of expression here, however, might come from J. Moses says to Yahweh, "Thou hast said, 'I know you by name, and thou hast found favor with me, too,'" (Ex. 33:12 and cf. the practically parallel 33:17.) In Ex. 31:2 (P), "I have called Bezaleel by name", the idea is of calling for a specific purpose, and I cannot see with Cheyne that there is any closer relation to the Second Isaiah passage than is present in other references using "name". Exactly the same use as in 43:1 occurs in Is. 45:3. The reverse, being called by the name of the Lord, is more common; see Is. 44:5, 48:1-2.

The parallel between Is. 46:11 b:

I have spoken and I will bring it about;
I have purposed and I will do it,

and the JE passage, Nu. 23:19b:

When he has said something, will he not do it?
When he has asserted something, will he not make it good?

is particularly interesting in a longer context. The question in Numbers is Balaam's saying the words put into his mouth by Yahweh. But Is. 46:11 ties the idea up with the much disputed

Who calls from the East this agent of mine,
From a distant land the man of my purpose?

Taken without the Is. 41:2 passage, it would certainly seem as if we had Balaam mentioned here, and quite appropriately to Second Isaiah's thinking, for it is he who lays so much stress on the fulfillment of ancient prophecy as evidence of Yahweh's omniscience and omnipotence (cf. 44:7 ff.), while it is Baalam into whose mouth God put the blessing at the very beginning of Israel's history -- a blessing which must fulfil itself, even if in an eschatological future. Cf. also Is. 41: 4, 11, which also reminds us of the Balaam story.

In 47:7:

I shall remain forever, mistress of all time,

an awkward construction in regard to the word "forever" is exactly paralleled in Gen. 49:26,[1] the Blessing of Jacob.

---

[1]Cheyne, Prophecies I, p. 308. But see ante p. 79.

In 48:20:

Go forth from Babylon, flee from Chaldea,

and again in 43:14, in similar context, Second Isaiah uses בְּרִיחִים,בָּרַח a word which Torrey finds borrowed from Ex. 14:5 (J).[1]

In 49:20:

Give place to me, (used in this peculiar sense) has an exact parallel, says Skinner, in Gen. 19:9 (J). Usually it means to draw near. Cf. Is. 65:5 "draw near to thyself", meaning to stand off -- a different, though synonymous verb.[2]

---

[1] Second Isaiah, p. 379. See discussion under 52:11, p. 110 ante.

[2] Isaiah, p. 96. So also Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 18.

B. D

Several additional allusions to Deuteronomy seem to warrent attention and to bear out the conviction that the author, even in his earlier days, knew both the code proper and introductory and supplementary sections.

With Is,. 41:10:

> Fear not, for I am with you.
> Be not dismayed for I am your God.
> I will strengthen you, I will help you,
> I will uphold you by my true right hand,

compare Deut. 31:6,8

> Be strong, be brave, have no fear, do not stand in dread of them, for the Lord your God will be going with you, never failing you nor forsaking you.
>
> The Lord will be the one to go ahead of you; it is he who will be with you, never failing you nor forsaking you; do not be afraid or dismayed.

There seems an undeniable relationship here. One might refer, too, to Gen. 26:24 (J), where God says, "fear not, for I am with you" (the same expression) to Abraham, but the parallel to the D passage is more extensive. Torrey says, "the same words, the same application." Cf. 42:6 and 45:1 (where, Torrey finds, the glossator has introduced Cyrus.)[1] Because of the strong verbal correspondence between J and Second Isaiah we might expect the sequence to be J, Second Isaiah, Deuteronomy.[2]

---

[1] Second Isaiah, p. 316

[2] This would seem to make Pfeiffer's date of 550 for Deut. 31:1-13 (IOT, p. 187) too early. Driver

In Is. 47:1:

> No more shall you (daughter of Babylon) be called tender and delicate,

the phrase"tender and delicate" is the same used in Deut. 28:56, but the reference cannot be directly to that passage, which refers to the Israelites. It may have been common parlance, though the words do not occur together elsewhere in the Old Testament.. On the other hand, it is quite probable that Second Isaiah knew the phrase through familiarity with the D passage, and simply adopted it to use in another context.

With Is. 57:13:

> He who takes refuge in me shall inherit the land,

compare Deut. 4:1, which says:

> Heed my statutes. . . . . that you may go in and occupy the land which the Lord, the God of your Fathers is giving you.

See also Deut. 1:8, 4:40, 5:33, etc. This seems at first too common a concept to be significant, but just this idea of possessing the land as a reward for faithfulness to Yahweh apparently comes to Second Isaiah from the introduction to Deuteronomy. The Second Isaiah passages seem to be a reference to a characteristically Deuteronomic concept (i.e., the complete Deuteronomy?)[1]

(LOT, p. 72) regards this as original Deuteronomic material, but admits the dividing line between D and D2 in c.29-34 cannot be fixed with confidence.

[1]Driver gives all these passages to the original D. LOT, p. 72. Cf. p. 71, ante, re relation to Deut. 5:26, p. 85 f. re Deut. 1:31.

Is. 59:10:

> We grope like blind men along a wall. . . . .
> We stumble at noonday as in the twilight. . . . .

comes very close to being a direct quotation of Deut 28:29:

> So that you shall go groping at noon as the blind grope in the dark. . . . .

Cheyne says: "It is not clear at first sight which passage was original, and which the imitation."[1]

Torrey suggest an emendation in the last line of the Second Isaiah passage to מִמְּךָ וְעָנֵנוּ[2] in line with Deuteronomy and Job 5:14, but we cannot base dependence on emendations made in the indicated direction, and so far as our inquiry is concerned it is unnecessary. The relationship to the D passage is strong enough as it is.

Is. 63:15:

> Look down from the heavens and see,
> From thy holy and glorious abode!
> Where is thy zeal and thy might,
> Thy yearning pity and mercy?

recalls the prayer to be offered at the sanctuary as given in Deut. 26:15:

---

[1] Prophecies II, p. 84. If further research was more illuminating, I have not found that he reported it.

[2] Second Isaiah, p. 441. Pfeiffer, IOT, p. 184, makes 28:25-42 a post-exilic interpolation. Driver, LOT, p. 72, assigns it to the original D material.

> Look down from the heavens, thy sacred dwelling place, and bless the people of Israel, and the soil which thou hast given us, as thou didst swear to our fathers.

The imperative "look down from heaven", says Cheyne,[1] is peculiar, this Hebrew form occurring only in these passages and Psalm 80:15,[2] nowhere else. Combined as it is in each of the above passages with the appositive "thy holy and glorious abode" or "thy sacred dwelling place" it would seem to be practically a quotation.

We might normally expect the poetic form to be the original, but the priority of the code is scarcely subject to question.

If 63:7-64:2 is a Samaritan prophecy as L.E. Browne suggests,[3] there is something particularly pathetic in the contrast of Is. 63:19:

> We have become like those who have never been called by thy name,

with the proud boast of Deut. 28:10:

> The people of the earth shall see you bear the name of the Lord and stand in fear of you.

Cf. Is. 43:7, 65:1, Jer. 14:9, and the discussion of Is. 48:11, p. 88, ante. This particular emphasis on the protection and honor of bearing Yahweh's name is Deuteronomic and the dependence is on the part of the more negative Is. 63:19.

---

[1] Prophecies, II p. 108.

[2] Cf. Ps. 14:2, 53:2, and Is. 64:1, "O that thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down."

[3] Op. cit.

C. P

We have already discussed practically every passage from Second Isaiah where relationship to P was suspected. One verse which seems to have been generally overlooked however gives us what seems to be a bit of definite information as to comparative dates. This is Is. 60:6 f.:

> A flood of camels shall cover you,
> The young camels of Midian and Ephah;
> And those of Sheba shall come. . . . .
> All the flocks of Kedar shall gather to you;
> The rams of Nebaioth shall minister to you.

The first three names are from the J geneology in Gen. 25:2-4, while the last two are from the P geneology immediately following in Gen. 25:13. Especially since P's Sheba geneology occurs at some distance in the Pentateuch (Gen. 10:7), the coupling of the two groups of names can scarcely be interpreted otherwise than that the author knew Gen. 25 in its present form when he wrote this passage. A most amazing thing is to find Second Isaiah fairly quoting from two geneologies, in what is frequently considered one of his most poetic moments.[1] Moreover, chapter 60 is one of the latter part of the book most generally conceded as original.

Cheyne calls attention to the use of the word קדש in 66:17; he says it occurs twelve times in Leviticus, but only here in prophecy.[2]

---

[1] Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 89, speaks of the use of tribal names with "poetic liberty"; Torrey, Second Isaiah, p. 447, explains the choice of these lesser known nations as poetically appealing because "picturesque and far away."

[2] Intro., p. 272.

Note A

A report on the following passages seemed necessary either because the writer was forced to disagree with a recognized authority who had expressed himself on the subject, or because a passage displayed apparent relationships which had to be rejected on closer investigation, or because there actually did seem to be some relationship though too slight or indefinite to weigh in our investigation.

40:2: Her guilt is paid in full.
Skinner (Isaiah, p. 2) says that the word which he translates "pardon" is rare in this sense, usually meaning "to be pleased with". Here it means to "pay off a debt to the satisfaction of the creditor." Cf. Lev. 26:41, 43, Chron. 36:21. Cheyne (Prophecies I, p. 243) states that the sense of this passage is determined by the Leviticus (H) passage, Yahweh's promise to remember his covenant if the people will confess their iniquities and make amends. But aside from the fact that paying ones debts and making amends are common enough concepts, the Leviticus passage implies initiative on the part of the blameworthy one, which could not be claimed for Israel. I fail to recognize dependence.

40:2: Double for all her sins.
Torrey sees in this only a hyperbole, and cites similar rhetorical expressions (Koran, Sur. 7:36, 34:36, 33:68). He invites comparison with such passages as Is. 43:25, 48:9 which say emphatically that the coming blessings are not to be based on merit or atonement of Israel, but the free grace of Yahweh. Second Isaiah indulges in a similar hyperbole in regard to the utter unworthiness of his people (42:18, 48:1b, 65:1 f.) (Second Isaiah, p. 305.) Skinner thinks the idea of the servant is involved here, but admits, rightly, that the implication cannot be stressed. (Isaiah, p.3.) Cheyne (Proph.I, p. 243, II, p. 34) draws attention to 51:21, where "Jehovah cannot bear to see his people suffer any longer than is necessary; therefore he will interpose to help them."

A case of double penalty occurs in Ex. 22:7 (E), but double restitution rather than double punishment is involved. Moreover the Exodus passage refers to a specialized case-- robbery and receiving stolen property-- which so far as we know were not included in Israel's list of crimes. There is, moreover, no suggestion in Second Isaiah that Israel has become legally entitled to restoration. We are safe in saying there is no literary relationship to the E passage.

40:10: See the Lord is coming with might (with a strong hand) his own arm having won him the kingdom.

Use of "arm" as a symbol, or more nearly, a hypostasization, of Yahweh's power, is characteristic of Second Isaiah (51:5, 9, 52:10, 53:1, 59:16, 63:5, 12) and is an important part of his interpretation of history and eschatology. As Cheyne puts it (Intro., p. 243 ff., cf. p. 251, 255, and Proph., p. 246 f.), "at the fit moment the arm of Yahweh should 'awake' and the great deeds of antiquity should be more than paralleled." One thinks quite naturally of the Yahweh-nisi passage, Ex. 17:9-16 (E). Was Second Isaiah familiar with this passage or with the legend back of it? If so, is there an element of monotheistic protest involved here (cf. 63:9)? Though not impossible, Second Isaiah's phrase could be sufficiently accounted for by his acceptance of current Semitic anthropology which made the member the source of the function. Cf. Ex. 6:6 (P) and Ex. 15:16. In nome of these is the relationship close enough for any claim of dependence.

40:11, the figure of the good shepherd.
In the literature of a sheep-raising country there is no call to cite such passages as Gen. 33:13 (J). We have mentioned Sellin's theory that the Moses of lost tradition was a shepherd, and the coupling of the Rock and Shepherd ideas both in Second Isaiah and the Blessing of Gen. 49.

40:18: To what can you liken God? Cf. 40:25, 46:5. This might be a protest against J anthropomorphisims. Cheyne (Proph.I, p. 249) is quite sure it is not a protest against idolatry, since the Jews addressed did not make images of Yahweh. It is in keeping with Deut. 4:15, "you saw no form at all when the Lord spoke to you at Horeb out of the fire", but is probably just a favorite rhetorical question of the poet's to express the omnipotence of God, and is not dependent on any particular source.

41:11: Behold they shall all be ashamed and confounded who are inflamed against you.

The same thought occurs 45:24, 60:12, Ex. 23:22 (E). In E Yahweh promises to be "an enemy to your enemies and an adversary to your adversaries", but there is no verbal relationship, and the thought in E is integrated with the angel's going before the Hebrews-- an idea with which Second Isaiah does not hold. One could see similarity of thought to the Balaam story, too, but scarcely dependence.

41:8 f.: But you, Israel, my servant,
Jacob whom I have chosen . . . . .
Cf. 43:1, Deut. 7:6, 10:15. There is a strong similarity of feeling in the Deuteronomy and Second Isaiah passages, but the idea of Israel's choice by Yahweh is so pervasive of the whole of Hebrew religion that without stronger verbal similarities we are not justified in claiming actual relationship.

41:14-16: Ye men of Israel forms, says Skinner (Isaiah, p. 20) a weak parallel to Thou worm Jacob. It is generally taken for an ellipses for "ye few men of Israel" as if it were מתי מספר as in Gen. 34:30. No evidence of dependence.

41:18: On bare heights.
Cf. Nu. 23:3, where, however, the text is doubtful. (Skinner, Isaiah, p. 21.)

41:23: Yea, do good and do evil.
Cheyne (Proph.I, p. 260) sees the equivalent of the "right or left" idea of Nu. 20:17, 22:26 (both JE), Deut. 2:27, Jon. 4:11. See also Gen. 31:24 (E), Nu. 24:13 and Lev. 5:4, in which the form of expression is different. It means "at least do something." There is no convincing evidence of relationship.

42:6: A pledge to the people.
Skinner (Isaiah, p. 28) points out the possible translation "a covenant people" after the analogous construction Gen.16:12 (J) but admits this is "somewhat strained". I cannot see Torrey's view that here as in 54:10, 55:3 and Deut. 7:9, the counter obligations of the covenant are almost eclipsed. The reference is of no value to us.

42:14: Cf. the special use of the word חרישתי here and in 64:11, also Gen. 45:1 (J).(Cheyne, Intro., p. 272.)

42:21: הגדיל, make glorious, occurs only here and Ex. 15:6, 11, but the latter is late (Cheyne, Intro., p. 272.)

44:7: Since I placed the people of antiquity.
Whether this refers to the chosing of Abraham or the creation of Adam seems a fruitless discussion until the main lines of Second Isaiah have been reconstructed with far more certainty than they have up to the present time. There is no call to see dependence in such an allusion, at any rate: Second Isaiah knew both stories.

44:11: מְאֹד, might, utmost effort, is used says Torrey (SI, p. 348) exactly as in Deut. 6:5, II Kings 23:25. He says, "It may well be that the passage in Deuteronomy suggests the ironic use here. But this depends on a restored text, so can scarcely be admitted as evidence.

44:19: Considereth in his heart (called to mind). Literally, bringeth it back to his heart. A rare expression says Skinner (Isaiah, p. 52), occurring Is. 46:8, Deut. 4:39, 30:1, I Kings 8:47. Cf. Torrey, SI, p. 353. But the less emphatic שׁוּב אֶל לֵב is common enough.

45:3: I will give you the treasures of darkness
The hoards of secret places,
That you may know that I am the Lord.

Torrey (SI, p. 358) translates אֹצְרוֹת hidden treasures, i.e., treasures of the Messianic age. Cf. 48:6, Deut. 32:34, Her. 33:3; also Deut. 33:19, where, however, a different word is used. Cheyne (Prophecies II, p. 3) quotes Nagelsbach and Kimchi as translating 48:6 "only now have they been prophecied" (rather than "created"). This he characterizes as "an unsuccessful attempt to preclude the inference which has been drawn from this passage in favor of a Babylonian origin for Second Isaiah." Deut. 32:34 refers to the venom of dragons and poison of cobras sealed up in the Lord's treasuries against the day of revenge and requital. The Deut. 33 passage is scarcely parallel and uses a different word. Jeremiah is the closest:

Call to me and I will answer you and tell you great
and secret things which you know not.

I think we cannot use any of these passages to show relationship of Second Isaiah to the Pentateuch.

45:23: By myself I have sworn.

Skinner finds the form of the oath in Is. 49:18: As I live, saith Yahweh, and the injunction to use it in Deut. 6:13 (Isaiah, p. 67). The injunction occurs again, Deut. 10:20. Cheyne says that to so swear was the outward sigh of an Israelite, and the use in Is. 48:1 is ironical -- the average Israelite's swearing was not in "truth and righteousness." (Prophecies II, p. 1). There is a similarity of language between Is. 45:23 and Gen. 22:16 (J), "I swear by myself"--it is the oracle of the Lord. But there is no comparable context. Cf. Gen. 24:3 (J), Lev. 19:12, Josh. 2:12 (cf. 23:7, I Sam. 30:15, II Sam. 19:7. The idea is too common to be significant for our purposes.

47:2: Mention of the slave girl grinding meal is not a reference to Ex. 11:5 (P), mentioning the slave girl who sits behind the mill. Such a figure must have been familiar enough and there is no corresponding context.

47:6: I was angry with my people,
I profaned my heritage,
I gave them into your hand,
You showed them no pity.
On the aged you made your yoke to press very heavily.

This seems to refer in retrospect to the events prophesied in Deut. 28:49 f. We may have a before and after view of the same event, but there is no real evidence that Second Isaiah had the Deuteronomic passage in mind. The Lord had warned his people of the outcome of their evil ways many times. Is. 48:18 shows the poet's regret that his people did not chose the better (of the Deuteronomic?) alternative. The arrogance of Babylon, presuming that because she had been used as an instrument of chastisement by Yahweh, she would "remain forever, mistress of all time" (Is. 47:7) is the sort of thing foreseen in Deut. 32, where Yahweh feared that Israel's enemies, misunderstanding their triumphs, would say, "It is our might that has triumphed." When prophetic thought accepted the theory of Assyria and Babylon as instruments of God's wrath for Israel's chastisement, it naturally raised acutely the question of the responsibility of these nations for their acts. Judaism's answer was the figure of the wicked shepherds so familiar in Enoch.

There is similarity of thought, but no real evidence that the Second Isaiah passage is dependent on Deuteronomy.

48:16: I the Lord have sent him
Endowed with my spirit.

Cheyne (Proph.II,p.7) says, "I cannot help think with Kleinert. . . . that we have both here and in Gen.1:2 an early trace of what is known as the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit." We cannot, however, claim relationship on such grounds.

49:21: Who hath begotten thee.

Rather, says Skinner,(Isaiah, p. 96), "who hath borne thee (in spite of the masculine verb)-- a peculiar figure explained by the custom illustrated in Gen. 16:1 (P), 30:1 ff. (E) of giving the maid to the husband for children. The reference has no weight for us.

50:1: Cheyne, Intro., p. 272, calls attention to pre-exilic use of כריתות as here, Deut. 24:1,3 and Jer. 3:8, only.

50:2: Is my hand too short to redeem? Cf. 59:1. The relation to Nu. 11:23: Is the Lord's power so limited? is scarcely close enough to have significance.

50:4: The Lord has given me a tongue for teaching. The Lord asks Moses (Ex. 4:11 - J), "Who gives man a mouth or makes him dumb, or deaf . . . . . Is it not I, the Lord?" But the reference is just as close to Is. 6, or, especially, Jer. 1:9. There is certainly no reference to Ex. 21:5 f., Deut. 15:16 f., concerning the piercing of the servant's ears. The reference has no value for us. Likewise the reference to "shame and spitting" (50:6) is only to a common gesture of disrespect, not to Nu. 12:14 or Deut. 25:9, where it is mentioned.

50:7: Cheyne cites occurence of the word flint, here and in Deut. 8:15, 32:13, but both the D passages are exilic. (Intro., p. 272.)

50:8: Who will challenge my rights? Skinner (Isaiah, p. 103) finds a similar expression Ex. 24:14. Probably a legal term and not significant.

51:6: The heavens shall vanish like smoke,
And the earth shall wear out like a garment
While the inhabitants shall likewise die.

Torrey thinks Cheyne's emendation to "like gnats (or lice)" as in Ex. 8:16 ff. a pity, since it would be weak in meaning and spoil the meter (SI, p.398). Skinner finds the use of) unique here unless for Nu. 13:33 (JE). Elsewhere, too, he points out, the world order is everlasting (Isaiah, p.108.) The poet does not press this point here or elsewhere; it is doubtful if he expected to be taken literally. This is neither protest nor a sign of unfamiliarity with the theology of other writers.

51:14: Nor shall his bread fail. The resemblance which Driver sees to Deut. 34:7, concerning Moses' unusual virility, is based on an amendment to "neither shall his natural force fail him" (JTS 36, 1935, p.402). Findings based on such texual changes are too precarious to use as evidence. Cheyne (Prophecies II, p. 80) parallels this substitution in 58:10, translating "minister thy sustenance" instead of "share your bread with the hungry". Skinner (Isaiah, p. 166) goes all the way with "draw out thy soul" (cf. Deut. 24:6). But we cannot find evidence for our purposes in any of these passages.

51:16: And I put my words in your mouth. Second Isaiah uses this phrase again, 59:21, and Cheyne finds the Servant's statement in 49:2 a parallel in phraseology and idea (Proph.II, p. 35). Deut. 18:18 uses the phrase "put my oracles in his mouth". But J had used the similar "put the words in his mouth" in regard to Aaron (Ex. 4:15); and in Nu. 23:16 (JE) the Lord put the message in Balaam's mouth. It is a thought so natural to Hebrew anthro-

pology and religion, that probably the affinities are less than the similarities of wording might indicate. How else would a Hebrew express the idea? Cf. discussion of 50:4, above.

53:8: Through violence in judgment was he taken away,
And who gave thought to his fate?
Cheyne (Prophecies II, p. 47) says the word judgment is used here as in "judgment of death" (Deut. 21:22).
Torrey (so Kimchi) finds the meaning for דּוֹר, his race, his line, in Deut. 32:20 (cf. Ps. 73:15, 112:2). He cites Gen. 43:7 (J) as a perfect parallel to the construction in which the verb is not a simple past but potential (so Genenius, Kautzsch): "how was anyone to think it worthy of notice? (SI, p. 420.)

54:13: All your sons shall be taught by the Lord.
Cheyne's translation , All your children shall be disciples of Jehovah ("i.e., prophets in the wider sense") recalls Nu. 11:29 (E), O that all the Lord's people were prophets, but that is as much as we can say for it. (Prophecies II, p.57.

54:15: Cf. the same expression גָּר אִתָּךְ
Ex. 12:48(P), Lev. 19:33; no assurance of dependence.

56:11: Each without exception.
The same idiom in Gen. 19:4 (J), is not compulsive evidence.

58:2: Daily, indeed, they consult me
And delight to know my ways.
Torrey suggests the use of כִּרְבַת אֶת־ in the following lines does not have the same significance as in Ps. 73:28, but is to be compared with that in 41:1, 21, and Deut. 1:17; but there seems no further evidence of relationship here. (SI, p. 438.)

59:2: Your iniquities have been a barrier.
We can attach no significance as does Skinner (Isaiah, p. 169) to the fact that the same word for barrier is used concerning the firmament in Gen. 1:6.

59:21; Cheyne (Intro.p. 272) cites similarities of style with Gen. 9:9, 17:4 (P).

60:15: Instead of being forsaken and hated.
Zion is referred to as Yahweh's bride. The word "hated" is so used Deut. 21:15 and Gen. 29:31 of a less beloved wife. (Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 91.) But the figure is so common and the contrast between loving and hating so obvious that no significance can be attached.

61:11: Cheyne (Intro.,p. 272) says cf. the use of יָלַל in Lev. 11:37.

65:20b cf. Gen. 5.
65:22 cf. Deut. 28:30 (form).
65:23 cf. Lev. 26:16 re הַבְהִלָה (also Jer. 15:8 and Ps. 78:33).

These references from Cheyne (Intro. p. 272) are rather slight in themselves, but they suggest that it might be worth while to make a careful check of sources for the eschatological ideas of this chapter.

66:12: Extending her prosperity.
Cheyne (Proph. p. 126) translates "directing her peace", as "directing" kindness in Gen. 39:21 (J). The reference has no special interest for us.

66:15: The Lord shall come like fire.
The reference is not to Deut. 5:22 f., or other theophanies, but to the eschatological fire of the future (Kohut, quoted by Cheyne, Proph. II, p. 126, contra.) We have remarked about the many references to fire which occur in Second Isaiah, in our discussion of the Exodus. Consuming fire becomes a favorite theme with the apocalyptists; as in them, so here, the fire in which the Lord comes is the instrument of his judgment.

66:18: And tongues.
Cheyne refers to the same use in Gen. 10:5,20,31 (P), which, however, he finds based on a Phoenecian document(Proph.II,p.128). Cf. Zech. 8:23. The unusual use here would indicate knowledge of either P or the Phoenecian source (if Cheyne is right.)

66:20: Cheyne (Proph. II, p. 130) finds the word "litters" elsewhere only in Nu. 7:3 (P). (In Lev. 11:29 it is the name of an animal.) No particular value to us.

Note B

A special discussion of proper names should be included in a comparison of these documents, but a somprehensive treatment soon proves too lengthy to include here. To point the direction such a discussion might take is all we can do.

Most important, perhaps, would be a comparison of the names used for the deity. Unless otherwise indicated the following represents a checking of Mandelkern against the list of divine names in Cheyne, Intro., p. 254.

יהוה is a common appelation with Second Isaiah as with P and practically all Old Testament writers. It is the name used in the theophanies of the Pentateuch, while Second Isaiah seems to play upon the idea of its origin, turning in the direction of metaphysics. See 40:28, 41:4, 43:10, 44:6, 48:12.

אלהים occurs in almost every chapter of Second Isaiah. The less common אל occurs 40:18, 42:5, 43:10,12, 44:10,17, 45:14,15, 20,21,22, 46:6,9. It has been pointed out that elohim is the god of Abraham and Noah, but never of Moses in the Pentateuch. See the note on p. 85 f. re the theory which has been advanced that the author of Deut. 32 is the originator of the title אלהים used by Second Isaiah,44:8.

Cf.the fact that קדוש used without the usual "of Israel" or an article occurs for the first time (unless Job 6:10 is early) in Second Isaiah (57:15.) Cf. 40:25, 41: 14,16,20, 43:3,14,15, 45:11, 47:4, 48:17, 49:7, 54:5, 55:5, 58:13, 60:9,14: the usual "holy one of Israel". Elsewhere only late, including Jer. 50:29, 51:5 and three times in Psalms. Cf. קדשים without the article, Prov. 9:10, 30:3, Hos. 12:1.

מלך is used by Second Isaiah 41:21, 43:15, 44:6. Cf. 57:2. It has been frequently pointed out that this term is avoided by pre-exilic prophets in speaking of Yahweh. (Cf. Am. 5:26, Zeph. 1:5, Is. 33:22, Zech. 14:19, Deut. 33:5, 17 or more Psalms, Nu. 23:21, 24:7,8, Ex. 15:18.) The idea of God as King seems to be part of Second Isaiah's eschatology. Is this in accord or contrast to the enthronement hymns? P, like the early prophets, seems to have rebelled at the idea of confusing kingship and godship as did the other Semitic nations, but Second Isaiah saw the eschatological implications of a universal God who must, eventually, be king of all people.

אביר is used with Jacob, Is. 49:24,26, 60:16, Ps. 132:2,5. Cheyne, Intro., p. 270, says Second Isaiah is not imitating the "mighty one of Israel" of Is. 1:24, for there "mighty one of Israel" seems deliberately substituted for "mighty one of Jacob" in Gen. 49:24; Second Isaiah and Ps. 132:2,5, are closer to the Genesis song than Isaiah. Similarly Skinner, Isaiah, p. xlvi. But cf. ante, p. 79 f. re Gen. 49.

אדיר , though also a universally used Semitic term, occurs only once in Second Isaiah by itself (first Isaiah uses it 22 times.) Second Isaiah uses יהוה אלהים 13 times. Cf. the expression in the strange Gen. 14:23: "Lord most high, creator of the heavens and the earth."

צור occurs Is. 44:8, six times in Deut. 32. Cf. note, ante, p. 81.

יהוה צבאות occurs Is. 44:6, 45:13, 47:4, 48:2, 51:15, 54:5. It is use over 40 times in first Isaiah, never in the Pentateuch. It is used only concerning the invasion. Yet Cheyne says:"Formalism is reprehended by pointing to the moral requirements of Jehovah, nationalism by adducing the most comprehensive of the Divine titles, Jehovah Sabaoth." Cf. Is. 6:3. (Proph.II, p. 2.) But see a possible association with Judges 5:20.

גאל becomes almost a divine title with Second Isaiah, occurring 12 times, the corresponding verb 6 times. Cf. Skinner, Isaiah, p. 20. See ante, p. 125. Cf. Lev. 25:48, Nu. 35:19, Ruth 3:12, all legalistic uses.

As to other proper names:

It is strange that Second Isaiah, so concerned with the idea of the creation, and who mentions the patriarchs more than any other prophet does, has no mention of Adam. We have sufficient evidence that he knew the Gen. 2-11 non-Priestly source, and there is mention of Eden in 51:3:

He shall make her wilderness like Eden,
Her deserts like the garden of the Lord.

Cf. Gen. 13:10, where the Jordan basin looks to Lot "like the Lord's own garden."

To Torrey (Second Isaiah, p. 397) this passage from Second Isaiah is "one of the numerous indications that the prophet has read the book of Genesis." It is at least evidence that he knew the non-Priestly Gen. 2-11 source and drew upon it as he did upon other early literature. There is nothing particularly curious in the fact that he mentions Eden but not Adam. Literary allusions do not exhaust the materials to which reference is made.

There is much discussion as to whether the mention of the "first father" (43:27) is to Adam. I see no reason why it should not be, nor why there should be such an apparent desire on the part of scholars to avoid this obvious explanation. (Skinner says the reference cannot be to Abraham, who never "sinned", and "still less to Adam". It must be to Jacob. Isaiah, p. 45. So also Cheyne, Prophecies I, p. 281. See Cheyne for a summary of scholarly opinions. Cf. "people of antiquity" (44:7) and Cheyne's note, ibid, p. 285. Torrey mentions the possibility of the reference being to Abraham or Jacob (no mention of Adam!) but says the author means "thy representative" -- an archetype of all the great figures of Hebrew history. Delitsch, Commentary, p. 148, thinks Abraham was meant, definitely repudiating the too universalistic Adam.

Deut. 32, King James version, refers to the Most High making division "among the sons of Adam", but Meek, in the Chicago translation, prefers the more general term "mankind".

If we admit the close relationship between Deut. 32 and Second Isaiah, this could be taken as evidence that Adam was the "first father" referred to here.

The parallel construction between the first line of 51:3 and Ezek. 36:35 is so marked as to suggest dependence or a common source. The garden of Elohim occurs in Ezek. 28:13 and 31:8,9, but as the home of the King of Tyre! The northern location, the emphhasis on precious stones, fires and trees, has affinities with Enoch's findings at the ends of the earth.

The only other mention of Eden outside the Genesis stories is in Joel 2:3. An allusion to Adam occurs in Job 31:33.

Noah has been sufficiently discussed in chapter II.

Abraham and Sarah: There are three references to Abraham:

41:8: Thou, Israel, seed of Abraham, my friend.
51:2: Look to Abraham your father.
63:16:Though Abraham know us not.

51:2 is the only reference to Sarah outside of Genesis. The possibility of 43:27 referring to Abraham as the "first father" has been discussed.

Abraham and his seed, as the chosen of God, has antecedents in all sources, even in Gen. 14, where there seems to be some peculiar connection with the divine title "God most high" which has been discussed. Torrey seems to put a minimum of significance on the mention of the actual name, and thinks that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are "used interchangably" as representing this people chosen by God to fulfil his mission, i.e., as God's servant. (SI, p. 316.) See Is. 43:1,4, 48:14.. Abraham is spoken of as God's servant in Gen. 26:24 (J). The idea of the nation being chosen by Yahweh is strong in the framework of Deuteronomy, e.g., 7:6, 10:15, 32:8-9. Cf. Skinner, Isaiah, p. xxxi, 18, Is. 43:10, 44:1 f.,49:7. Deut. 9:27 is an appeal to "remember thy servants, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; pay no attention to the obstinacy of this people." Cf. Ex. 32:13. The implication is of the patriarchs as archetypes not of the whole nation, but of the righteous within the nation: a process of gradually narrowing selection, culminating, for Second Isaiah, in the Suffering Servant concept. Cf. Gen. 12:1-3 and 22:17-18 (both J) emphasizing the blessing of the whole earth through Abraham. Torrey, SI, p. 396, re Is. 51:2 says,"the prophet is not trying to encourage his countrymen by showing them Abraham, a successful man (so Duhm) but is reiterating the argument of c. 40-49 concerning what it means to be chosen of Yahweh."

Cheyne, Prophecies II, p. 29, suggests that 51:2 is Second Isaiah's answer to Ezek. 33:24 (concerning how much more they that are many should be blessed, since Abraham was only one.) Cheyne thinks Second Isaiah felt the blessing was for the few genuine believers. For Abraham as "father" see Gen. 26:3, 28:13, 32:9 (all J) Mic. 7:20.

All references to the "seed" of Abraham, as Is. 41:8, are late: II Chron. 20:7, Ps. 105:6, Jer. 33:26. The idea is inherent in Gen. 17 (P) but we cannot suggest direct dependence.

Whether the "righteous one of the East" has any connection with Abraham, or refers to Cyrus we certainly cannot take up here. See 41:2,25, 45:1, 46:11, Gen. 14:14.

Torrey, SI, p. 315, sees in the frequent challenge to the nations to "foretell the future" a focus on the divine purpose of Yahweh advancing steadily from Abraham to the Messianic kingdom (43:7,9, 44:7, 45:21, 46:10 f., 48:3,14, 57:12.)

Isaac is not mentioned by Second Isaiah. Possibly he knew what some modern scholars suspect: that he was only invented to fill in a chronological gap.

Jacob is mentioned again and again in paralellism with Israel as referring to the nation.. 45:3 uses the House of Jacob and the remnant of Israel in this manner. But I fail to see any particular connection with the fact that it is P who tells of the change of Jacob's name to Israel in connection with his removal from Shechem to Bethel. (Gen. 35:10.) In 41:8, 45:4, 58:14, 65:9, where the form is that of speaking of an individual, the context makes it clear that the figure is an archetype. See Skinner's comments under the discussion of Abraham, ante. The name Jeshurun for Israel has been discussed in chapter II under Deut. 32.

Joseph is completely ignored by Second Isaiah.

Moses has been sufficiently discussed in chapter II under the heading of the Exodus.

Joshua is not mentioned.

CHAPTER IV

A SUGGESTED RECONSTRUCTION

Our final word must be one not so much of conclusion as of speculation. As we pointed out at the very beginning, the tentative conclusions are merely evidence which should be checked with other contemporary or near-contemporary writings. Till this is done, we have, perhaps, no right to say more than has already been said under the various headings of Chapter II. Still, such a comparison of passages, words and ideas as we have engaged in would be far from inspiring without the hope that through it may evolve a picture of the time and conditions under which the greatest of Israel's prophets lived and wrote -- a theory to be tested and which it is hoped may gain strength in the light of subsequent rigid investigation. I suspect that most people who have been sincerely devoted to the study of Second Isaiah carry some such tentative picture constantly in their minds. It is only when the picture becomes static, and in defending it we forget its tentative nature, that our integrity becomes less than worthy of our subject, and the cause of Biblical scholarship suffers. With this foreword as to its speculative nature, I suggest:

Isaiah 40-66 is (essentially) the work of one prophet, who lived in Babylon at the close of the exile and returned with one of the first groups. The Priestly editor and Second Isaiah both belonged to the "literary group"

among the exiles who not only had available the Hebrew literature of the day (brought, perhaps, by an exiled priesthood when they left Palestine) but who were familiar also with the cosmopolitan literature of the Babylonian libraries. The importance of preserving Hebrew religion through a literature became evident with the breakdown of Israel's other religious institutions due to the exile and the old story of the willingness of the common people to compromise with the ways of foreign gods. The religious leaders agreed on the problem but not on the answer.

P said in effect: "We must put our history and our Torah into definite form, an authoritative document to which our people can refer.. Without such a statement of orthodoxy, they will continue to synchronize further and further with the similarly rooted Babylonian religion. It will be best in rewriting our history to use those sources which emphasize the exclusivism of the Hebrew religion and the Egyptian aspect of the nation's beginnings and her covenant with Yahweh."

But Second Isaiah replied, in effect, "What profits it to keep the institution of religion in tact, unless man understands the nature of the God behind that religion? The God of Israel is the God of all people. It is Yahweh, the God of holiness and justice and loving-kindness, for whom all people are seeking.. It is what he represents that

they are all trying to express in different ways through their varying myths and legends. It is the qualities He stands for, in the prophetic religion of Israel, that must eventually mean the way of blessedness to all men." A code for the guidance of the common people? Deuteronomy embodied the historic Torah of the Hebrew religion. To be sure it had a northern origin. But surely one could not distort history in the name of a God of truth, nor keep open, in the name of religion, a breach with a sister nation who worshipped the same universal God. Wasn't the Book of Noah, surely one of the most important documents of Hebrew literature, and with such a message of hope as it had for the returning Israelites, too, to be embodied in the new "canon"?

The Priestly school, of course, had their way. By the time the first exiles returned, the story of the Exodus from Egypt and the regulations of Leviticus were "accepted" in Priestly circles.

But true to the supreme genius of the Hebrew people, which was willingness to listen to the prophetic voice of protest, the final Pentateuch not only contained the non-Priestly source of Gen. 2-11, which had originally been ignored, but also the old code of Deuteronomy 12-26, with the rather clumsy editorial attempts to attribute it to

Moses and at the same time do some justice to the non-Egyptian story of the invasion, as set forth in Deut. 32: 1-43, a product of the "school" to which Second Isaiah belonged.. Other "songs" of the Pentateuch may well be the work of this same school, or of one author, for whom we have suggested an identification as Second Isaiah's teacher.

Thus in the relationship of Second Isaiah to the Pentateuch we see at its grandest and in one event the whole story of the Hebrew religion: the tendency to exclusivism and legalism in an attempt to maintain the purity of the faith, held in tension with the prophetic voice that says that the God of the Universe, the creator of all flesh, can be compassed by no human institution. In the balance of that tension the Hebrew-Christian faith has survived.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Albright, W. F. Stone Age to Christianity.
Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1940.

Bacon, B.W. Genesis of Genesis.
Hartford: Student Publishing Co., 1893.

_____. Triple Tradition of the Exodus.
Hartford: Student Publishing Co., 1894.

Bewer, J. Literature of the Old Testament.
N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1922.

Box, G. E. Book of Isaiah.
London: Pitman, 1908.

Burkitt, F. C. Jewish and Christian Apocalypses.
London: Oxford University Press, 1914.

Burrows, Millar. Literary Relations of Ezekiel.
Philadelphia: Jewish Publishing Society, 1925.

Buttenwieser, M. Psalms.
Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1938.

Charles, R. H. Book of Enoch.
London: SPCK, 1917.

Cheyne, T.K. Introduction to the Book of Isaiah.
London: Whittaker, 1895.

_____. Prophecies of Isaiah.
London: Whittaker, 1892.

Clay, A. T. A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform.
New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922.

Cook, S. A. The Old Testament, a Reinterpretation.
London: SPCK, 1936.

Cooke, G. A. "Paradise Story in Ezekiel XXVIII" in
Old Testament Essays.
London: Griffin, 1927.

Cornill, C. H. Prophets of Israel. S.F. Corkran, tr.
Chicago: Open Court, 1897.

Delitsch, Franz. Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies
of Isaiah. James Denney, tr.
N.Y.: Funk and Wagnall, 189_.

Driver, S. R. Deuteronomy ICC.
N.Y.: Scribners, 1895.

_____. Literature of the Old Testament.
N.Y.: Scribners, 1913 ed.

Duhm, B. Twelve Prophets.
London: Black, 1912.

Eissfeldt, O. Einleitung in das Alte Testament.
Tübingen: Neue Theologische Grundrisse, 1934.

Frazer, J.G. Folklore in the Old Testament.
N.Y.: Macmillan, 1918.

Gaster, Moses. The Samaritans.
London: Oxford University Press, 1925.

Guillaume, A. Prophecy and Divination.
N.Y.: Harpers, 1938.

Kayser, Aug. Das Vorèsilische Buch der Urgeschichte Israels.
Strassburg: Schmidt, 1874.

Koehler, L. W. Theologie des Alten Testaments.
Tübingen: Mohr, 1936.

Meyer, Eduard. Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme.
Halle: Niemeyer, 1906.

Mowinckel, S. Two Sources of the Predeuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen. 1-11.
Oslo: Dybwad, 1937.

Oesterley, W.O.E. and Robinson, T.H. Hebrew Religion.
N.Y.: Macmillan, 1930.

Pfeiffer, R. H. Introduction to the Old Testament.
N.Y.: Harpers, 1941.

Robinson, H. W. "Law and Religion in Israel" in Law and Religion.
London: Sheldon Press, 1938.

_____, ed. Record and Revelation.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938.

Schultz, H. Old Testament Theology. J.A. Paterson, tr.
Edinburgh: Clark, 1892.

Sellin, E. Introduction to the Old Testament.
N.Y.: Doran, 1923.

Skinner, J. Genesis ICC.
N.Y.: Scribners, 1910.

_____. Isaiah XL-LXVI (Cambridge Bible Series).
Cambridge: University Press, 1898.

Smith, G.A. Book of Isaiah XL-LXVI.
N.Y.: Armstrong, 1890.

Smith, J.M.P. Origin and History of Hebrew Law.
Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1931.

_____. "Syntax" in Old Testament Essays.
London: Griffin, 1927.

Stamm, Johann. Erlosen und Vergeben im Alten Testament.
Bern: A. Francke, 1940.

Torrey, C.C. Second Isaiah.
N.Y.: Scribners, 1928.

Wellhausen, J. Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.
Berlin: Reimer, 1905.

Encyclopedia Articles

Cheyne, T.K. "Noah" in Encyclopedia Biblia, col. 3245.

Gilmore, G. W. "Creation" in New Shaf-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religions Knowledge, III, p. 296.

Gunkel, H. "Dragon" in Jewish Encyclopedia IV, p. 648.

Hirsch, E.G. "Cosmogony" in Jewish Encyclopedia IV, p. 280.

Kay, D.M. "Noachian Precepts" in Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics IX, p. 380.

Peters, J.P. "Cosmogony and Cosmology (Hebrew)" in Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics IV, p. 152.

Periodical Articles

Albright, W. F. "The Babylonian Matter in the pre-Deuteronomic Primeval History (JE) in Gen.1-11". JBL LVIII p. 87 ff., 1939.

Browne, L. E. quoted in "Notes on Recent Exposition". ET XXXII p. 341, 1921.

Cook, S.A. "The Servant of the Lord". ET XXXIV p. 440.

Driver, S.R. "Note". JTS XXXVI p. 402, 1935.

Erdmans, B.D. "Reflections on a Synogogue Inscription". Quantulacumque (1937) p. 37.

König, Ed. "Kalendarfragen in althebraischen Schrifttum". ZDMG LX p. 605 ff., 1906.

May, H.G. "Creation of Light in Gen. 1:3-5." JBL LVIII p. 203, 1939.

_____. "Evolution of the Joseph Story". AJSL XLVII p. 93, 1931.

_____. "A Key to the Interpretation of Zechariah's Visions." JBL LVII p. 173, 1938.

Morgenstern, J. "Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel." HUCA X, 1935.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

IOT	Introduction to the Old Testament
LOT	Literature of the Old Testament
SI	Second Isaiah
EB	Encyclopedia Biblia
HERE	Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics
JE	Jewish Encyclopedia
AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages
ET	Expository Times
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
ZDMG	Zeitschrift der Morgenländische Gesellschaft.

Unless otherwise indicated, the JEDP analysis is from Driver, Literature of the Old Testament. Where mention is made of S, the reference is to Pfeiffer's identification of the non-Priestly source in Gen. 2-11.

GTU Library
3 2400 00687 3412

LIBRARY USE ONLY